

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
May 17, 2017**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 3:00 PM, in the Board Room, Development and Business Services Center, 1901 S. Alamo
- The meeting was called to order by Chairman Guarino, and the roll was called by the Secretary.

PRESENT: Guarino, Conner, Cone, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Grube, Brittain, Garcia
Absent: Benavides, Garza

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements
 - Spirit of Sarah King: Festival of the Arts - Sarah S King Elementary School - May 18 - 5PM
 - Amazing Preservation Race for Kids - San Antonio Zoo - May 20 - 7AM
 - Mission Possible: World Heritage Bus Tour
 - New Frontiers Charter School Festival of the Arts - May 25 - 5PM

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:

Barbara White Howll- Historic District Guidelines
Rhett Smith- Mission Concepcion
Ron Rocha- Mission Concepcion
Lance Aaron- Mission Concepcion

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| • Item # 1, Case No. 2017-D06 | 307 DWYER AND THE EAST SIDE OF THE 400 BLOCK OF S MAIN |
| • Item # 2, Case No. 2017-163 | 131 W AGARITA AVE |
| • Item # 3, Case No. 2017-222 | 426 N MONUMENTAL |
| • Item # 4, Case No. 2017-239 | 224 E CAROLINA ST |
| • Item # 5, Case No. 2017-223 | 202 SAN ARTURO |
| • Item # 6, Case No. 2017-225 | 1127 S ST MARYS |
| • Item # 7, Case No. 2017-232 | 1431 W LYNWOOD |
| • Item # 8, Case No. 2016-233 | 513 E LOCUST |
| • Item # 9, Case No. 2017-234 | 2142 W MAGNOLIA AVE |
| • Item #10, Case No. 2017-236 | 834 VIRGINIA BLVD |
| • Item #11, Case No. 2017-237 | 715 S RIO GRANDE POSTPONED BY APPLICANT |
| • Item #12, Case No. 2016-245 | 425 N FLORES ST POSTPONED BY APPLICANT |
| • Item #13, Case No. 2016-246 | 127 CROFTON |
| • Item #14, Case No. 2016-214 | 309 N ALAMO ST |

Items #1 and #6 were pulled for Citizens To Be Heard, and item #14 was pulled for a recusal.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to approve the Consent Agenda with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Conner, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Grube, Brittain, Garcia
NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

COMMISSIONER CONE ARRIVED AT 3:20

1. HDRC NO. 2017-D06

Applicant: Josh Pollock, Argyle Residential

Address: 307 DWYER AND THE EAST SIDE OF THE 400 BLOCK OF S MAIN

REQUEST:

May 17, 2017

The applicant requests a Certificate of Appropriateness to build a new 327-unit, five-story multi-family residential development wrapped around a 5 ½-story parking garage, located in the 300 Block of Dwyer Avenue and the 400 Block of South Main Avenue (property bound by Dwyer Avenue, Stumberg, South Main Avenue, and Old Guilbeau Street). The proposal includes entirely new development, comprising the majority of the block, with frontage on all four streets. Signage is not included in this request and will be submitted separately when the development name has been chosen.

FINDINGS:

The proposed development and design meet the purpose and intent of the **Downtown Design Guide** required standards and encouraged guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval as submitted, as shown in the attached Exhibit Package (**Exhibits A-N**).

CASE MANAGER:

Micah Diaz, Planning Coordinator, Department of Planning & Community Development

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Susan Beavin- SACS, made comments about the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to move for approval with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Conner, Cone, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Grube, Brittain, Garcia

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

6. HDRC NO. 2017-255

Applicant: Jim Poteet/Poteet Architects

Address: 1127 S ST MARYS

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to remove the existing concrete paving and install a circular driveway featuring decomposed granite.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure at 1127 S St Mary's was constructed circa 1955 as an automobile service station. The site has previously featured impervious paving to serve as automobile parking. At this time, the applicant has proposed to remove the existing concrete paving on site and install a circular driveway of decomposed granite with concrete curbs to feature twenty-three (23) feet in width. Additionally, the applicant has noted the installation of landscaping on the lot to surround the proposed circular driveway.

b. Staff performed a site visit on April 17, 2017, and noted the installation of the decomposed granite driveway prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

c. DRIVEWAY – Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B., driveways and curb cuts should be similar to those found historically throughout the district. Curb cuts and driveway configurations vary along S St Mary's. Staff finds the installation of a circular driveway of decomposed granite a reduction in the previous impervious cover and appropriate.

d. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has noted the installation of landscaping in other areas of the lot where the proposed driveway is not located. The applicant is to provide a detailed list of landscaping items and a landscaping plan to staff prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through d with the stipulation that the applicant provide staff with a detailed list of landscaping items and a landscaping plan prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Cherise Bell- spoke in oppositions to the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to move for denial of the applicant's request

May 17, 2017

AYES: Guarino, Conner, Cone, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Grube, Brittain, Garcia
NAYS

THE MOTION CARRIED

14. HDRC NO. 2017-214

Applicant: Dana Delao/Hansco Inc

Address: 309 N ALAMO ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to demolish the rear addition of the historic structure and secure the rear façade.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure at 309 N Alamo was constructed in 1899 in the Folk Victorian style and features single story columns on both the first and second levels, a plaster covered brick façade, a decorative roof parapet and a long slope shed porch roof. The rear addition features two stories, a brick façade and modern proportioned window and door openings. This addition was construction circa 1945 and first appears on the 1951 Sanborn Map. Within this request, the applicant has proposed to demolish this rear addition.

b. The UDC Section 35-643(b) notes that the distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure, object or site and its environment, shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features should be avoided when possible. As previously noted, the existing addition was constructed approximately 45 years after the original structure and does not feature the architectural characteristics of the primary historic structure. Staff finds this rear addition to be eligible for demolition given its lack of architectural significance and its obscuring of the original rear façade of the primary historic structure.

c. While staff finds the removal of the rear addition appropriate; staff finds that architectural documents including a rear elevation, floor plans and detailed wall sections of the rear wall are to be submitted to staff prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness and permits.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends conceptual approval based on finding b with the stipulation that architectural documents including a rear elevation, floor plans and detailed wall sections of the rear wall are to be submitted to staff prior to the approved by the HDRC prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Grube to move for approval with staff stipulations.

AYES: Conner, Cone, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Grube, Brittain, Garcia

NAYS:

RECUSAL: Guarino

THE MOTION CARRIED

15. HDRC NO. 2017-213

Applicant: Samuel Aguirre

Address: 419 E FRENCH PLACE
423 E FRENCH PLACE
427 E FRENCH PLACE
431 E FRENCH PLACE
435 E FRENCH PLACE
439 E FRENCH PLACE
443 E FRENCH PLACE
447 E FRENCH PLACE
451 E FRENCH PLACE
455 E FRENCH PLACE
459 E FRENCH PLACE

May 17, 2017

463 E FRENCH PLACE
410 E FRENCH PLACE
414 E FRENCH PLACE
418 E FRENCH PLACE
422 E FRENCH PLACE
424 E FRENCH PLACE
430 E FRENCH PLACE
434 E FRENCH PLACE
438 E FRENCH PLACE
442 E FRENCH PLACE
446 E FRENCH PLACE
450 E FRENCH PLACE
454 E FRENCH PLACE
456 E FRENCH PLACE
458 E FRENCH PLACE
462 E FRENCH PLACE
467 E FRENCH PLACE
471 E FRENCH PLACE
475 E FRENCH PLACE
466 E FRENCH PLACE
470 E FRENCH PLACE
474 E FRENCH PLACE
478 E FRENCH PLACE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for a Finding of Historic Significance for the East French Place Historic District and a recommendation for approval to the Zoning Commission and to the City Council for historic district designation. The proposed district will include East French Place between N St. Mary's and US Hwy 281. It contains 33 non-municipal parcels total.

FINDINGS:

a. The proposed district was platted in 1922 by H.C. Thorman, who proceeded to build 42 modest Craftsman bungalows. The development pattern of consistent deep setbacks, front porches that clearly address the street and similar home sizes make for a strikingly coherent streetscape. The Upper Labor Acequia originally provided the terminus for the eastern edge of this street. UDC Section 35-607 (a) states that historic districts shall consist of at least two or more structures that meet at least three of the designation criteria. The proposed East French Place Historic District meets criteria 1, 3, 4, 7 and 10. All 33 of the structures included in the proposed boundary meet these criteria.

b. The applicant is requesting approval for a Finding of Historic Significance for the East French Place Historic District and a recommendation for approval to the Zoning Commission and to the City Council for historic district designation.

- The proposed district will include East French Place between N St. Mary's and US Hwy 281. It contains 33 non-municipal parcels total.
- An application for historic district designation was received on October 5, 2016.
- A public informational meeting for potential historic district designation as held on November 10, 2016, for property owners. 20 of the 33 property owners were present at this meeting.
- On April 11, 2017, the staff of the Office of Historic Preservation received 51% in support of the designation. In accordance with the UDC, staff has forwarded the application to the HDRC for review.

c. Criterion 1, per UDC Sec. 35-607(b)(1), is that a structure has a value as a visible or archeological reminder of the cultural heritage of the community, or national event. All of the proposed structures meet criterion 1 in that the Upper Labor Acequia originally provided the terminus for the eastern edge of this street.

d. Criterion 3, per UDC Sec. 35-607(b)(3), is that a structure has identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the development of the community, county, state, or nation. All of the proposed structures meet criterion 3 in that they are included in a neighborhood that was platted by a prominent San Antonio builder, H.C. Thorman in 1922.

e. Criterion 5, per UDC Sec. 35-607(b)(5), is that a structure has embodiment of distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, type, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials. All of the proposed structures meet criterion 5 in that they are located on one single street that is still a dense intact collection of only craftsman style bungalows built all by H.C. Thorman in the 1920s.

f. Criterion 7, per UDC Sec. 35-607(b)(7), is that a structure has an area has a unique location or singular physical characteristics that make it an established or familiar visual feature. All of the proposed structures meet criterion 7

May 17, 2017

in that they are within a collection of modest houses reflects the economic status of trades and craft workers of the early 20th century. All of the homes are uniform in style, size, setbacks, rooflines, and other architectural features.

g. Criterion 10, per UDC Sec. 35-607(b)(10), is that an area has character as an established and geographically definable neighborhood, united by culture, architectural style or physical plan and development. The proposed district meets criterion 10 in that the neighborhood shares a common history visible in its common architectural style, development pattern within the H.C. Thorman plat, and location with dense residential blocks surrounded by commercial corridors along St. Mary's.

h. Historic districts possess cultural and historical value and contribute to the overall quality and character of the City. The City offers a tax incentive for all residential properties occupied by the property owner at the time of the designation. The incentive is a 20% tax exemption on City taxes for 10 years provided the owner remains in the property.

i. The City also offers a Substantial Rehabilitation tax incentive. After substantial rehabilitation of a historic property, the property owners may choose one of two tax incentives, including having the city property taxes frozen for 10 years at the pre-rehabilitation value, or paying no city property taxes for the first five years, and for the next five years, city property taxes are assessed at the value that is 50% of the post-rehabilitation assessed value.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of the proposed Finding of Historic Significance and that the Historic & Design Review Commission recommend approval for the designation of the East French Place Historic District to the Zoning Commission and to the City Council for historic district designation based on findings a through i.

CASE COMMENTS:

- If the HDRC concurs that the proposed district meets criteria and is eligible for designation and recommends the historic district designation for the East French Place Historic District, then their recommendation shall be submitted to the zoning commission. The zoning commission shall schedule a hearing within 45 days of receipt of the HDRC's recommendation and shall forward its recommendation for either approval or denial to the city council. The city council shall schedule a hearing to be held within forty-five (45) days of its receipt of the zoning commission's recommendation. The city council shall review and shall approve or deny the proposed historic district.

- Per UDC Sec. 35-453, once the commission makes a recommendation for designation, property owners shall follow the historic and design review process before permits can be issued, until a final resolution from City Council. Written approval (a Certificate of Appropriateness) must be obtained for any exterior work.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Paula Bondurant, Susan Beavin, George Rice, Fredrica Kushner, Anisa Schell.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to approve as submitted

AYES: Guarino, Conner, Cone, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Grube, Brittain, Garcia

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

16. HDRC NO. 2017- 183

Applicant: Office of Historic Preservation

Address: 320 IDAHO ST

REQUEST:

The Office of Historic Preservation is requesting a finding of historic significance for the property at 320 Idaho St.

FINDINGS:

a. The property at 320 Idaho is a two bay, wood frame shotgun house built in 1892. The applicant is requesting a finding of historic significance.

b. The property was built in 1852 by Frank J. Beitel for Thomas O. Foster. The structure has a front gable, with a symmetrical façade and a full length front porch with a shed roof. The shotgun house is a vernacular housing type that traces its cultural roots to West Africa and traveled with the slave trade first to the U.S.

- UDC Section 35-607 (a) states that historic landmarks shall meet at least three of the designation criteria.

The structure at 320 Idaho meets criteria 1, 4, 5, 8, and 12.

May 17, 2017

c. Criterion 1, per UDC Sec. 35-607(b)(1), is that a structure has a value as a visible or archeological reminder of the cultural heritage of the community, or national event. This property is a reminder of the cultural heritage of San Antonio, particularly the influence of rail yard labor on neighborhood development and housing typologies.

d. Criterion 4, per UDC Sec. 35-607(b)(4), is that a structure's identification as the work of a master builder, designer, architect, or landscape architect whose individual work has influenced the development of the community, county, state, or nation. This property is representative work of builder who influenced the city of San Antonio by establishing Beitel Lumber Company, which would eventually become one of the largest such businesses in the region.

e. Criterion 5, per UDC Sec. 35-607(b)(5), is that a structure has embodiment of distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, type, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials. This property is an embodiment of distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style of a time period, specifically the shotgun house. In San Antonio, shotgun houses are commonly, though not exclusively, located near railroads and provided housing for laborers in the industry. The preservation of this vernacular style is a challenge nationwide, and this property is a representative example within the community.

f. Criterion 8, per UDC Sec. 35-607(b)(8), is that a structure's historical, architectural, or cultural integrity of location, design, materials, and workmanship. This property is notable in its historical, architectural, and cultural integrity of location, design, and workmanship. Though modifications have been made over time by multiple owners, the overall footprint is consistent with the 1896 Sanborn Insurance Map and the home retains several key elements of the style.

g. Criterion 12, per UDC Sec. 35-607(b)(12), is the structure is an important example of a particular architectural type or specimen. This property is an important example of a shotgun house in San Antonio, which are increasingly threatened in part due to small size, old age, location in desirable neighborhoods, and lack of highstyle architectural detailing.

h. On February 3, 2017, the owner submitted a request for demolition to the Office of Historic Preservation. The owner does not support historic designation. If a Finding of Historic Significance is approved by the HDRC, the HDRC will become the applicant for the designation application before City Council. The Office of Historic Preservation shall process the application on behalf of the HDRC. City Council resolution to proceed with historic designation for the property is required before the property may be rezoned to include a historic zoning overlay. The owner is willing to contribute funds to the cost of moving the structure to another location for retention. OHP also supports relocation efforts as an alternative to demolition.

i. The Designation & Demolition Committee met at the site on May 9, 2017. The members present commented on the decorative features evident in the gable, molding under the roof eaves. They also noted that the main structure is fairly intact with the exception of the missing siding, and the original form is evident. The members agreed that the structure is a unique shotgun form and is culturally significant because of the location.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through i.

CASE COMMENTS:

· Per UDC Sec. 35-453, once the commission makes a recommendation for designation, property owners shall follow the historic and design review process before permits can be issued, until a final resolution from City Council. Written approval (a Certificate of Appropriateness) must be obtained for any exterior work.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Susan Beavin of SACS- spoke in support of the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to move for approval as submitted.

AYES: Guarino, Conner, Laffoon, Cone, Kamal, Garcia, Grube, Brittain, Lazarine

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

17. HDRC NO. 2017-197

Applicant: Tobias Stapleton

Address: 205 OSTROM

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Demolish the historic structure located at 205 Ostrom.

May 17, 2017

2. Construct a two story structure on the east end of the lot.
3. Construct a two story structure on the west end of the lot.
4. Construct an accessory structure.
5. Install three driveways/parking location on the site.

FINDINGS:

General Findings:

- a. This request was originally reviewed by the Design Review Committee on February 21, 2017. At that meeting, committee members commented on the proposed architecture and noted concerns regarding the proposed massing and turrets. A site visit was conducted with HDRC Commissioners, members of the River Road Neighborhood Association, neighbors and Office of Historic Preservation Staff on March 22, 2017. At that site visit, access was provided to both the exterior of the structure as well as the interior. This request was reviewed again by the Design Review Committee on April 25, 2017. At that time, a new design was presented to the committee and received positive feedback.
- b. Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.
- c. The River Road Historic District has been intensely opposed to the demolition of structures located within the district. The criteria outlined for the demolition of a contributing structure noted in UDC Section 35-618 is important to the public process.
- d. ARCHAEOLOGY – The project area is within the River Improvement Overlay District and the River Road Local Historic District. A review of historic archival maps shows the Upper Labor Acequia crossing the property. Therefore, Archaeological investigations may be required.

Findings related to request item #1:

1a. The structure located at 205 Ostrom was constructed circa 1935 and is located within the River Road Historic District. The structure features traditional architectural elements including gabled roofs. The house features many of its original materials including wood siding and wood windows; however, modifications to the form of the historic structure have resulted in the removal and enclosing of the front porch, which now presents itself as a screened porch.

1b. The loss of a contributing structure is an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of San Antonio. Demolition of any contributing buildings should only occur after every attempt has been made, within reason, to successfully reuse the structure. Clear and convincing evidence supporting an unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant if the application for a certificate is disapproved must be presented by the applicant in order for demolition to be considered. The criteria for establishing unreasonable economic hardship are listed in UDC Section 35-614 (b)(3). The applicant must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that:

A. The owner cannot make reasonable beneficial use of or realize a reasonable rate of return on a structure or site, regardless of whether that return represents the most profitable return possible, unless the highly significant endangered, historic and cultural landmark, historic and cultural landmarks district or demolition delay designation, as applicable, is removed or the proposed demolition or relocation is allowed;

[The applicant has provided detailed cost estimate for rehabilitation of the structure which is approximately \$535,000. This bid was provided by a contractor who was approved by the applicant's financing provider. The applicant has noted that the rehabilitation or new construction at this site is limited to a contractor that is recommended and approved by their financial provider. The applicant has noted that financing for the proposed rehabilitation and new construction has been limited due to the current condition of the structure.]

B. The structure and property cannot be reasonably adapted for any other feasible use, whether by the current owner or by a purchaser, which would result in a reasonable rate of return;

[The applicant has provided information in the form of a structural report from the selected contractor which notes that the structure is suffering from intense dry rot that has impacted the structure to the extent that certain beam joists and studs have been structurally compromised. Additionally, the structural analysis provided by the contractor notes the collapse of the floor in certain areas, the collapse of ceiling and the roof structure, infestation of wood worm and the presence of fungus throughout the structure.]

C. The owner has failed to find a purchaser or tenant for the property during the previous two (2) years, despite having made substantial ongoing efforts during that period to do so. The evidence of unreasonable economic hardship introduced by the owner may, where applicable, include proof that the owner's affirmative obligations to maintain the structure or property make it impossible for the owner to realize a reasonable rate of return on the structure or property.

[The applicant has not provided staff with information noting the active marketing of this property to potential purchasers. The applicant has noted that the structure has been vacant for approximately twenty-three years. The applicant has noted that through the demolition of the existing structure, two new residential structures could be constructed which would be financially feasible.]

1c. Staff finds that the applicant has begun to provide information to build a case for an economic hardship; however, at this time, staff finds that the applicant should provide additional information regarding the cost of the proposed new construction in relationship to the cost to rehabilitate the existing structure. Staff has requested this information from the applicant.

1d. As previously noted, the structure contains many historic building materials including wood siding and wood

May 17, 2017

windows; however, exterior modifications including those to the front porch and disrepair including the failure of the roof and floor structure have lessened the structure's architectural significance.

Findings related to request item #2:

2a. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic example found on the block. The applicant has proposed an orientation that is consistent with the historic examples found throughout the district. Regarding setbacks, this lot features an irregular shape, presenting itself as an island. The applicant has proposed a setback that is similar to setbacks found along a typical street in the front, while side setbacks and close to side streets.

2b. ENTRANCES – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrance towards the intersection of Ostrom and Magnolia Avenue. Staff finds this appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

2c. SCALE & MASS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. The applicant has proposed a two story structure with an overall height of 24' – 3". Many structures in the immediate vicinity feature either one or one and a half stories of height. While the applicant has proposed two stories, many of the neighboring structures feature additional height and steep pitched roofs. Staff finds the proposed height to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

2d. FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundations. The applicant has proposed a foundation height of 1' – 6". This is appropriate for the district and is consistent with the Guidelines.

2e. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed roof forms that include both front and side gabled roofs. Each street, Ostrom, Magnolia Avenue and the intersection of the two will have a gable oriented towards them. Staff finds the proposed roof forms appropriate.

2f. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. The applicant has featured window openings that feature historic heights and widths as well as window groupings that are found historically on Craftsman structures. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

2g. LOT COVERAGE – The building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of total lot area. The applicant's proposed building footprint is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.i.

2h. MATERIALS – The applicant has noted the use of a standing seam metal roof and board and batten siding. Staff finds that the board and batten siding feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½" wide, that the standing seam metal roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish. A large profiled ridge cap shall not be used.

2i. WINDOW MATERIALS – At this time, the applicant has not provided information regarding window materials. Staff recommends the installation of wood windows that are consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, Window Policy Document as noted in finding n that are to include traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details.

2j. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – New buildings should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in natural and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Generally, the proposed structure is consistent with the Guidelines; however.

Findings related to request item #3:

3a. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic example found on the block. The applicant has sited this structure in the middle of the lot. Generally, given the dimensions and shape of the existing lot, staff finds this arrangement appropriate.

3b. ENTRANCES – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrances towards both Ostrom and Magnolia Avenue. Staff finds this appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

3c. SCALE & MASS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. The applicant has proposed a two story structure with an overall height of 24' – 0" for the primary mass and 28' – 9" for the two stair towers. Many structures in the immediate vicinity feature either one or one and a half stories of height. While the applicant has proposed two stories, many of the neighboring structures feature additional height and steep pitched roofs. Staff finds the proposed height to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

3d. FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundations. The applicant has not specified the foundation height for this structure; however, staff finds that it should be comparable to that of

May 17, 2017

the first structure and be consistent with the Guidelines.

3e. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed a flat roof for the second structure. Historic roof forms throughout the River Road Historic District typically feature gabled or hipped roofs. There are historic structures located throughout the district that feature flat roofs, typically coupled with decorative roof parapets and Spanish Eclectic detailing. The applicant has proposed both horizontal and vertical siding; however, staff finds that if a flat roof is to be proposed, additional detailing at the roof parapet is to be used.

3f. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. The applicant has featured window openings that feature historic heights and widths as well as window groupings that are typical for historic structures in the district.

3g. LOT COVERAGE – The building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of total lot area. The applicant's proposed building footprint is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.i.

3h. MATERIALS – The applicant has noted the use of both vertical and horizontal siding; however, has not noted the material. Staff finds the use of wood or Hardi board siding to be appropriate; however, staff finds that the horizontally oriented Hardi siding should feature an exposure of four inches, that the board and batten siding feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½" wide.

3i. WINDOW MATERIALS – At this time, the applicant has not provided information regarding window materials. Staff recommends the installation of wood windows that are consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, Window Policy Document as noted in finding n that are to include traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details.

3j. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – As previously noted, the applicant has proposed a flat roof in combination with horizontal and vertical siding. Typically, flat roofs that are found throughout the River Road Historic District feature Spanish Eclectic architectural detailing including decorative roof parapets. Staff finds that the applicant should fully utilize architectural elements that are consistently found on structures with flat roofs throughout the district in a contemporary manner.

Findings related to request item #4:

4a. ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – Between the two residential structures, the applicant has proposed to construct an accessory structure to facilitate parking for two automobiles. At this time, the applicant has not provided detailed elevations; however, the applicant has provided a site plan noting the general location and footprint of the accessory structure. Staff finds the location of this structure as well as its footprint to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that the applicant should adhere to the Guidelines for New Construction when developing the massing, elevations and architectural details of this structure.

Findings related to request item #5:

5a. DRIVEWAYS – The applicant has proposed to introduce two new curb cuts on the property to exist with an existing curb cut that is located on Ostrom Drive. The two proposed curbcuts and driveways will be located on both Ostrom Drive and Magnolia Avenue. The Guidelines for Site Elements note that historic profiles are to be used for the creation of curb cuts and that typical driveway widths are to be used, typically no wider than ten feet in historic districts; however, there are examples in the immediate area of curbcut and driveway widths that are wider than ten feet in width. Staff finds that the proposed driveway locations are appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Staff does not recommend approval of request item #1 based on findings 1a through 1c. Staff recommends that the applicant provide additional financial information, specifically information regarding the cost of the proposed new construction in comparison to the quoted price of rehabilitation.

2. If the demolition request in item #2 is conceptually approved by the HDRC, staff recommends conceptual approval of items #2 through #5 with the following stipulations:

i. That the applicant install board and batten siding feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½" wide, that the standing seam metal roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish on the proposed structure in request item #2.

ii. That the applicant install wood windows that are consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, Window Policy Document as noted in finding n that are to include traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details for structures #2 through #4.

iii. That the applicant should fully utilize architectural elements that are consistently found on structures with flat roofs throughout the district in a contemporary manner and incorporate materials that are appropriate for the proposed form for request item #3 as noted in findings 3e and 3j.

May 17, 2017

iv. That the applicant propose a design for the accessory structure that is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction as noted in finding 4a.

v. Archaeological investigations may be required. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the OHP archaeologists for review and approval prior to beginning the archaeological investigation. The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

CITIZEN TO BE HEARD: David Schmidt, Larry Damontino, Myfe Moore, Christopher Green, Raleigh Wood, Jim Cullum all spoke in opposition to the applicant's request.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

18. HDRC NO. 2017-180

Applicant: Ricardo Turrubiates/Tarramark Urban Homes

Address: 421-425 E MISTLETOE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting final approval of a housing development to include the following items:

1. A master site plan of six single-family, two-story detached homes. The lot will feature a central private common drive.
2. The design of four of the six proposed houses. Each of the proposed houses will be two stories with a second floor height of 20'-6" plus the roof pitch. Materials will include cement fiber board lap siding, asphalt shingle roof, and stucco and wood trim. The final design of the remaining two houses will be submitted at a later time.

FINDINGS:

a. The lots are located within the proposed Tobin Hill North Historic District. Per UDC Sec. 35-453, when a pending district is recommended by the commission for designation, property owners shall follow the historic and design review process until a final resolution from City council is made. The applicant has proposed to construct a housing development to include eight single-family homes, and is seeking final approval of the site plan and four of the six house designs.

b. The applicant was heard by the HDRC on April 19, 2017 for a proposal that included eight single family homes. The proposal was deferred to the Design Review Committee (DRC). The applicant met with the DRC on April 25, 2017 to consider the current plan proposal. The applicant outlined the updates from the proposal heard on April 19, which included: the modification of the site plan from eight single family homes to six single family homes; the change from using two prototypes to six different housing designs; the removal of two side driveways; the increase in yard space for each home; the addition of carports for two of the six homes; the elaboration in detail of the overall landscaping plan; and the increase in variety in the elevations. The applicant also provided an exhibit that placed the homes fronting E Mistletoe in the context of surrounding houses, which was a request from the April 19 hearing from the Commission. The DRC believed that the updated proposal was a step forward from the proposal heard on April 19 in terms of number of homes, architectural vocabulary, scale, and developed site plan. The DRC still echoed former concerns of drainage, potential desert factor in the landscape, side setbacks, and the proposal's consistency with the overall development pattern of the neighborhood. The DRC provided the application with suggestions on which case studies were relevant to the proposal and which exhibits would be beneficial to include or create for the May 17 hearing in order to illustrate the proposal comprehensively within the context of the neighborhood.

c. **CONTEXT** – The applicant has submitted exhibits that place the front-facing buildings in context of the E Mistletoe streetscape. Based on staff analysis, the scaling of the existing structures does not appear to be an accurate reflection of their height relative to the proposed buildings in terms of floor height, rooflines, and window and door sizes. The proposed buildings in this illustration do not appear to have their foundations rendered.

d. **FOOTPRINT** – As presented, individual units reviewed as standalone structures are generally consistent with the overall principles in the guidelines. However, when considering the proposed streetscape and context of the project, the proposed design does not relate well to the historic single-family residential nature of the district and the district's predominant developmental pattern. The applicant references Ewald St as a "pocket neighborhood" of 10 single-family detached homes. However, the homes all front a public city street in a manner consistent with historic developmental patterns of the neighborhood, and are clustered in a similar footprint and spatial configuration to houses that front the larger thoroughfares in the neighborhood like E Mistletoe. The homes are all also one-story. The applicant's proposed development of all two-story homes is located along a proposed terminal private dead end

May 17, 2017

within a much smaller overall footprint compared to the Ewald St cluster of homes when including the public street. The applicant also references the Mayfair Condominiums, located at the intersection of E Mistletoe and McCullough, as a representative precedent. This condominium is not located within the proposed district boundary and is not a representative example within the residential neighborhood context. The condominium also fronts McCullough, which is a much larger and busier thoroughfare than E Mistletoe. Additionally, the references the King's Court Senior Apartment complex, which is a cluster of four duplexes, as another representative example of footprint and spatial configuration. These structures are also one-story and are not included within the boundary of the proposed Tobin Hill North Historic District.

e. **MASSING AND SCALE** – The proposed Building 1 and Building 2 measure approximately 20'-6" in height without including the roof pitch. Prototype 1436 measures 28'-2" to the top of the roof ridgeline. While the proposed Tobin Hill North Historic District contains nine two-story single family homes, the rest of the block of E Mistletoe surrounding the proposed development contains single-story single family homes. Guideline 2.A.i stipulates that the height and scale of new construction should be consistent with nearby historic buildings and should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. Staff finds the proposed height inconsistent with this guideline.

f. **WINDOW SIZE** – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, window openings with a similar proportion of wall to window as compared to nearby historic facades should be incorporated. Similarity is defined by windows that are no larger than 25% in size and vary no more than 10% in height to width ratio from adjacent historic facades. Staff finds the proposed larger rectangular windows on all building prototypes measuring 3x5' and 3x4' consistent with this ratio. Staff also finds the proposed tripartite windows on the first floor of each prototype comparable to historic configurations. Staff does not find the use of square 2x2', rectangular 2x3', or circular peephole window styles consistent with this ratio nor with the window typologies of the proposed historic district.

g. **WINDOW AND DOOR PLACEMENT** – The proposed design for Building 1, Building 2, and Prototype 4.2B include the placement of windows and doors, including their trim, directly abutting rim board, roof trim pieces, and/or fiberboard on every elevation. This direct adjacency of materials and façade elements is not typical of historic approaches to fenestration. Additionally, on some elevations, the blank wall space between openings exceeds the continuous wall space recommendations in the guidelines.

h. **COLUMNS AND PORCH** – The Historic Design Guidelines note that new architectural details should be reflective of their time while respecting the predominant stylistic elements of the district. Additionally, new details should be simple in design and should complement, but not visually compete with, the character of historic structures within the district. The proposed houses each evoke Craftsman details, which are common in the proposed Tobin Hill North Historic District. However, the current porch configuration on both Building 1 and Building 2 feature one column and one faux column detail. Staff finds the configuration inconsistent with the predominant stylistic elements of porches in the district, which feature two columns and project towards the public right-of-way.

i. **ROOF** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, roof materials that are similar in terms of form, color, and texture to those traditionally used in the district should be incorporated. There is a mixture of roof materials amongst the proposed four houses. The proposed roofs are consistent with the guidelines in both material and form.

Building-Specific Findings

j. **BUILDINGS 1 AND 2** – Building 1 and Building 2 were submitted in the proposal heard by the HDRC on April 19, 2017. In staff recommendations, as well as at the hearing, it was noted that the windows did not comply with the OHP Window Policy document. It was also noted that these buildings did not feature full porches with two columns. The suggested modifications have not been made since the last hearing.

k. **PROTOTYPE 4.2B** – This design will be one of the two homes fronting the E Mistletoe streetscape, located at the southeast corner of the lot, as indicated in the submitted site plan. The 2-story house features a composition shingle hipped roof, a standing seam metal roof projecting from the first story to cover the entryway porch, stained 4x4" cedar post columns wrapped in painted hardi trim, and stained 4x4" cedar Craftsman-style brackets beneath the primary roofline. The first story wall material is painted horizontal fiber siding cement with a 6" profile, and the second story wall material is the same material in a 4" profile. A painted horizontal 2x12" stringer with trim cap is located slightly above the interior second floor level. The foundation is approximately 3' with concrete steps. The height is 19'-3" without the roof height included. Staff finds the proposed porch appropriate for the location of the home along E Mistletoe, as it projects towards the street and contains definitive columns, which mimic the development pattern and residential context of the neighborhood. The house features the 2x2" fixed windows mentioned in finding e as inconsistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, OHP Window Policy document, and historic fenestration patterns of the neighborhood. Additionally, this prototype is a verbatim replica submitted to the March 15 HDRC hearing for the project located at the 600 block of Burleson in Dignowity Hill. This prototype was approved for that particular development.

l. **PROTOTYPE 1436** – This design will be one of two homes fronting the E Mistletoe streetscape, located at the

May 17, 2017

southwest corner of the lot, as indicated in the submitted site plan. The 2-story house features a composition shingle hipped roof with a low-pitched front gable, a standing seam metal roof projecting from the first story approximately 2'-7 1/2" inches to cover the entryway porch, and 2x4 cedar joist framing in a Craftsman bracket style beneath. The wall material is horizontal fiber siding cement with a 6" profile on a majority of the structure, with horizontal fiber cement in a 4" profile covering the inset on the southeast corner. The foundation is 2' concrete with concrete steps. The total height of the structure is 28'-2" at the highest point of the roof ridgeline. Guideline 2.A.i stipulates that the height and scale of new construction should be consistent with nearby historic buildings and should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. Staff finds the proposed height inconsistent with this guideline. Additionally, the square windows on the second story of the left elevation are inconsistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, OHP Window Policy document, and historic fenestration pattern of the proposed district. The Historic Design Guidelines also note that new architectural details should be reflective of their time while respecting the predominant stylistic elements of the district. Staff finds the proposed front elevation overhang inconsistent with street-facing porches of the district.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend final approval of the submitted designs at this time based on findings a through g. Staff recommends the following:

- a. The applicant explores designs that respond to the context of the district versus utilizing designs that are built or proposed in other parts of the city.
- b. The applicant explores 1.5 story options or prototypes with a modified roof pitch to respond to the dominant historic massing context of the neighborhood.
- c. Fenestration patterns on all prototypes are revised to be more consistent with the size and placement common of historic facades in the district.
- d. That the front porch configuration for Prototype 1436 is modified to include two columns that project from the façade and engage the streetscape.
- e. That the proposed windows are true divided lites or a 1 over 1 configuration with wood screens featuring divided lites to reflect window configurations common in the district and the proposed modern Craftsman approach.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Fredrica Kushner, Gloria Herrera, Anisa Schell, Albert Arias, Rick Schell, Cindy Miller. Beatrice Moreno- spoke in opposition to the applicant's request. Lyn Swanson and David Honkala spoke in support of the applicant's request.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

VICE CHAIRMAN CONNOR REQUESTED A 5 MIN RECESS AT 6:05 PM

THE MEETING RECONVENED AT 6:10PM

19. HDRC NO. 2017-224

Applicant: K/T TX Holdings, LLC

Address: 631 BURLESON
1162 N OLIVE
1158 N OLIVE
1150 N OLIVE
1146 N OLIVE
1138 N OLIVE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct prototype 6, consisting of new elevations to be constructed at the 600 Block of Burleson. The proposed prototype is currently proposed to be located on lots 23, 31, 32, 34, 35 and 37, addressed as 631 Burleson, 1162 N Olive, 1158 N Olive, 1150 N Olive, 1146 N Olive and 1138 N Olive.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct prototype 6 at the 600 Block of Burleson. The proposed new design is not an amendment to a previously approved design, but a new design to further vary the facades of the new construction within this development. Previous prototypes have been approved by the HDRC, most recently, prototype 4.2 A through D, at the March 15, 2017, HDRC Hearing.
- b. ENTRANCES – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i. primary building entrances should be

May 17, 2017

oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed for prototype 6 to feature front doors that are oriented toward the side yard. This is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that a front (south) facing front door should be incorporated into the proposed prototype.

c. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed both hipped and gabled roofs. Both of these roof forms are found historically throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District and are consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction.

d. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. The applicant has proposed a number of façade openings and window profiles that are not consistent with the Guidelines. Both side and rear elevations feature fixed windows and windows that feature sizes that are inconsistent with the Guidelines.

e. GARAGE DOOR – The applicant has proposed a rear facing garage door. Staff finds this location appropriate; however, staff finds that a garage door that features a profile consistent with those found on historic garage structures. Window lights should be included on the proposed door.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through e. Staff recommends the applicant address the following prior to returning to the HDRC.

- i. That the applicant install a south, front facing front door as noted in finding b.
- ii. That the applicant propose window openings that are consistent with those found historically throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District in regards to their size and profile.
- iii. That the applicant provide additional information on the proposed garage doors and include a garage door that features window lights.
- iv. That the applicant continue to incorporate the previously agreed upon window treatment which includes the installation of trim around each window opening.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Liz Franklin spoke in opposition to the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve the application with the side facing doors along with the remaining three stipulations from staff.

AYES: Guarino, Conner, Laffoon, Cone, Kamal, Garcia, Grube, Brittain

NAYS: Lazarine

THE MOTION CARRIED

20. HDRC NO. 2017-217

Applicant: Felix Ziga/Studio Ziga

Address: 1111 E CROCKETT ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a two story residential structure on the vacant lot at 1111 E Crockett.

FINDINGS:

. The structure located at 313 E. Mistletoe is one-story single family home with Craftsman style elements. It is a contributing structure in the pending Tobin Hill North Historic District. Per UDC Sec. 35-453, when a pending district is recommended by the commission for designation, property owners shall follow the historic and design review process until a final resolution from City Council is made. The applicant has proposed to remove an existing non-original rear addition and extend the primary roofline to the rear to add a new addition.

b. The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on March 21, 2017 and April 25, 2017. The March 21 meeting considered a proposal that removed the smaller subordinate rear gable by extending the rear roofline and demolishing the smaller rear gable in its entirety. This smaller gable was determined to be a character defining feature of the home. Concerns included distinguishing the original structure from the addition by use of material, the structural feasibility of the roof proposal, and how the addition will affect the public right-of-way. The applicant returned to the DRC in April with a modified proposal that retained the subordinate rear gable. This proposal, which matches that submitted for consideration at the HDRC hearing on May 17, extends the primary gable and integrates it with the northeast corner of the subordinate gable. All other material will remain. The DRC was in support of this proposal, but emphasized the need for clearer exhibits, including elevations from all sides, an existing and new floor and roof plan, additional photos of the structure to be impacted, and a full set of materials in order to make a final determination at the hearing. These exhibits

May 17, 2017

were received on May 10, 2017.

c. **REMOVAL OF EXISTING MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed to remove existing siding, a door, an interior window, and an 8-pane window from the rear façade of the structure. The portion of the structure proposed for removal is an addition added after the original construction date, which is confirmed from Sanborn Maps research. Staff finds the proposal acceptable and consistent with the guidelines.

d. **ROOF**– The proposal includes extending the existing primary rear roofline towards the rear to add additional interior square footage. Presently, a smaller and subordinate gable structure exists at the northeast corner of the addition. Staff and the DRC have determined this element to be a character defining feature of the style of the home. A previous proposal by the applicant proposed removing this element. The present proposal will retain the existing gable structure by integrating the extended roofline into the northwest corner of the rear gable, and retaining the remaining form and material as is. However, the north elevation indicates that the subordinate gable will be concealed from view with new wood plank siding. Staff finds the overall addition proposal generally acceptable, but does not find the concealing of a character defining feature consistent with the guidelines.

e. **HEIGHT** - According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions 1.B.v and 2.B.i, the height of an addition should be limited to the height of the original structure. The proposed height of the addition is no larger than the existing structure and will not be obtrusive to the visual from the public right-of-way. Staff finds the proposal consistent with these guidelines.

f. **MATERIAL TRANSITIONS** – According to the Historic Design Guidelines, additions should provide a clear visual distinction between old and new forms. The applicant received an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness to remove non-original asbestos siding and to restore existing original wood lap siding underneath. The applicant has proposed to use woodlap siding with a 6” profile on the new addition as an extension of the current material conditions, with a vertical trim piece on the sides to indicate where the addition begins relative to the existing structure. Staff finds the material consistent with the guidelines but finds the 6” profile incompatible with the exterior structure.

g. **FENESTRATION MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant has proposed to reuse an existing original interior wood window to be removed for the addition in the rear elevation of the addition. Additionally, the applicant has proposed to add a French door to the rear of the existing structure. The doors will not be visible from the public right-of-way and will be made of wood. Staff finds the proposal acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Staff recommends approval of the existing addition removal based on findings a through c.
2. Staff recommends approval of the addition and roofline extension based on findings a through g with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the siding be removed from the gable of the rear addition so the existing subordinate gable is visible. The applicant must submit final drawings to staff for approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.
 - ii. That the woodlap siding on the addition match the profile of the existing woodlap siding.
 - iii. That the new standing seam roof follow the Checklist for Metal Roofs in the Historic Design Guidelines. The roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish.
3. Staff recommends approval of the French door installation and salvaged window installation based on finding g.

CASE COMMENTS:

The applicant met with the Design Review Commission (DRC) on March 21 and April 25, 2017. The discussions are outlined in finding b.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Liz Franklin spoke in opposition to the applicant’s request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to move for conceptual approval with staff stipulations. Applicant must return to DRC before final approval.

AYES: Guarino, Conner, Laffoon, Cone, Kamal, Garcia, Grube, Brittain, Lazarine

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

21. HDRC NO. 2017-235

Applicant: Felix Ziga/Ziga Architecture Studio

May 17, 2017

Address: 1115 E CROCKETT ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a two story residential structure on the vacant lot at 1115 E Crockett.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct a two story house on the vacant lot at 1115 E Crockett in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The lot is located mid-block between N Olive Street and N Pine Street and adjacent to an unpaved alley, Lowe Street.
- b. Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.
- c. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on May 10, 2017. Commissioners found the proposed massing to be appropriate as well as the proposed materials. Commissioners noted concern regarding variation in the proposed façade arrangements and materials to provide a clear separation in the mirrored designs.
- d. The proposed new construction at 1115 E Crockett has been proposed in addition to new construction at 1111 E Crockett. Currently, these are two separate lots; however, the applicant has proposed to remove the lot line through a certificate of determination
- e. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic example found on the block. The applicant has proposed a setback of approximately ten (10) feet. The structures to the immediate west feature a setback of approximately twenty-five (25) feet. Staff recommends the applicant install a setback that is consistent with the historic setbacks found on the block.
- f. ENTRANCES – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrance toward E Crockett. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. SCALE & MASS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. There are examples of two story historic structures in the vicinity including one on the northwest corner of N Olive and E Crockett; however, this block of E Crockett is entirely composed of single story structures. Staff finds that the applicant should provide a street elevation noting the proposed new construction in comparison with neighboring historic structures to determine the new construction's impact.
- h. FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor height should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundation and floor heights. Historic structures on this block feature foundation heights of approximately two to three feet. Staff finds that the applicant should incorporate a foundation height that is consistent with those found historically on this block.
- i. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed a hipped roof. There are examples of hipped roofs on this block of E Crockett as well as throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The proposed roof form is consistent with the Guidelines.
- j. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. On the front façade, the applicant has proposed window openings that are sized to be similar to those found historically in the district with the exception of the window in the second floor bathroom. On the east and north elevations, the applicant has proposed window openings that are sized to be similar to those found throughout the district. The west elevation is generally void of fenestration and is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the applicant introduce fenestration to the west façade that is comparable to that found on the other proposed facades, introduce an additional window to the rear façade's second floor and introduce a window on the front façade that is at least half of the height of the other proposed window openings on the front façade.
- k. LOT COVERAGE – Per the Guidelines, the building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of the total lot area. The proposed new construction is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.i.
- l. MATERIALS – Regarding materials, the applicant has proposed first floor materials to include horizontally oriented Hardi siding, a second floor of board and batten Hardi siding, eight inch square cedar columns, hog wire and cedar guardrails, cedar timber trusses and a standing seam metal roof. The applicant has noted that the proposed Hardi siding will feature a smooth finish. Staff finds that the horizontally oriented Hardi siding should feature an exposure of four inches, that the board and batten siding feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½" wide, that the standing seam metal roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish. A large profiled ridge cap shall not be used.
- m. WINDOW MATERIALS – At this time, window materials have not been identified by the applicant. Staff

May 17, 2017

recommends the installation of wood windows that are consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, Window Policy Document as noted in finding n that are to include traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details.

n. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – New building should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Staff finds the proposed architectural details to be generally appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. The applicant has incorporated the double height porch within the massing of the proposed structure, has proposed roof forms that are consistent with those found throughout the neighborhood and has proposed appropriate materials.

o. COLUMN DESIGN – The applicant has proposed eight in square cedar columns. Given the proposed height and porch massing, staff finds the proposed columns to feature an appropriate size; however, each column should feature both a capital and base.

p. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 6., all mechanical equipment should be screened from view at the public right of way. The applicant is responsible for complying with this.

q. DRIVEWAY – Adjacent to the proposed new construction, a public right of way, Lowe Street exists. Currently, this street is unpaved and a residential driveway approach exists where it meets E Crockett Street. The applicant has proposed to install a ribbon strip driveway in the public right of way to facilitate automobile parking at the rear of this lot and an adjacent lot which will also feature new construction. Staff finds the proposed rear parking location appropriate; however, the applicant shall coordinate with the City of San Antonio, Transportation and Capital Improvements Department to determine if the proposed installation of a ribbon strip driveway in the public right of way is appropriate and allowed.

r. SIDEWALK – At this time, the applicant has not proposed a front yard sidewalk to lead from the front porch to the public right of way. Front yard sidewalks are character defining features of historic neighborhoods. Staff recommends the applicant incorporate a front yard sidewalk in to the proposed new construction.

s. CARPORT – At the rear of the lot, the applicant has proposed to construct a carport to feature covered parking for two automobiles. The structure will feature forty (40) feet in length and ten (10) feet in width. Staff finds the general size and location of the proposed carports appropriate; however, the applicant should provide additional information regarding materials and details.

t. LANDSCAPING – At this time, the applicant has not provided a landscaping plan noting landscaping materials. Staff finds that a landscaping plan noting proposed landscaping materials should be submitted when returning to the HDRC for final approval.

u. FENCING – Front yard fences are found along this block of E Crockett; however, the majority of those that currently exist are chain link fences. The applicant has noted the installation of a cattle panel fence. Staff finds the installation of this fence appropriate; however, the height is not to exceed four (4) feet in height in the front yard.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings a through u with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant proposed a foundation height that is consistent with the Guidelines and historic examples found on this block of E Crockett as noted in finding h.
- ii. That the applicant provide a street elevation and additional massing information to determine the new construction's impact on the neighboring historic structures.
- iii. That the applicant incorporate window openings that are consistent with the Guidelines as noted in finding l.
- iv. That the applicant install wood windows that are to include traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details as noted in finding m.
- v. That the applicant provide a column detail noting the installation of a capital and base as noted in finding o.
- vi. That the applicant screen all mechanical equipment as noted in finding p.
- vii. That the applicant incorporate a front yard sidewalk as noted in finding r.
- viii. That the applicant provide a landscaping plan noting landscaping materials as noted in finding t.
- ix. That the applicant provide additional information regarding the proposed carport's materials as noted in finding s.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Liz Franklin spoke in opposition to the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Garcia conceptual approval with staff stipulations applicant must return to DRC before final approval.

AYES: Guarino, Conner, Laffoon, Cone, Kamal, Garcia, Grube, Brittain, Lazarine

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

May 17, 2017

22. HDRC CASE NO. 2017-216

Applicant: Felix Ziga/Studio Ziga

Address: 621 CENTER ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct one two-story home and a rear carport at 621 Center Street.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct a two story house on the vacant lot at 621 N Center Street in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The lot is located mid-block between N Hackberry Street and N Olive Street.
- b. Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.
- c. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on May 10, 2017. At that meeting, commissioners noted the proposed massing and materials appropriate. Commissioners noted that the façade void of fenestration should be amended to include window openings appropriate for new construction in a historic district.
- d. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic examples found on the block. The applicant has proposed a setback of approximately ten (10) feet, inconsistent with the historic structures on the block. Staff recommends the applicant install a setback that is consistent with the historic setbacks found on the block.
- e. ENTRANCES – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrance toward Center Street. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. SCALE & MASS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. There are no two story, residential historic structures on this block; however, two story structures do exist on the opposite side of the street. Staff finds that the applicant should provide a street elevation noting the proposed new construction in comparison with neighboring historic structures to determine the new construction's impact.
- g. FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor height should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundation and floor heights. Historic structures on this block feature foundation heights of approximately two to three feet. Staff finds that the applicant should incorporate a foundation height that is consistent with those found historically on this block.
- h. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed a front gabled roof. Gabled roofs are featured throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District as well as on the majority of the historic structures on N Center. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- i. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. On the front façade, the applicant has proposed window openings that are sized to be similar to those found historically in the district with the exception of the window in the second floor bathroom. On the west and north elevations, the applicant has proposed window openings that are sized to be similar to those found throughout the district. The east elevation is generally void of fenestration and is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the applicant introduce fenestration to the west façade that is comparable to that found on the other proposed facades, introduce an additional window to the rear façade's second floor and introduce a window on the front façade that is at least half of the height of the other proposed window openings on the front façade.
- j. LOT COVERAGE – Per the Guidelines, the building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of the total lot area. The proposed new construction is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.i.
- k. MATERIALS – Regarding materials, the applicant has proposed first floor materials to include horizontally oriented Hardi siding, a second floor of board and batten Hardi siding, eight inch square cedar columns, hog wire and cedar guardrails, cedar timber trusses and a standing seam metal roof. The applicant has noted that the proposed Hardi siding will feature a smooth finish. Staff finds that the horizontally oriented Hardi siding should feature an exposure of four inches, that the board and batten siding feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½" wide, that the standing seam metal roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish. A large profiled ridge cap shall not be used.
- l. WINDOW MATERIALS – At this time, window materials have not been identified by the applicant. Staff recommends the installation of wood windows that are consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, Window Policy Document as noted in finding n that are to include traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within

May 17, 2017

the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details.

m. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – New building should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Staff finds the proposed architectural details to be generally appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. The applicant has incorporated the double height porch within the massing of the proposed structure, has proposed roof forms that are consistent with those found throughout the neighborhood and has proposed appropriate materials.

n. COLUMN DESIGN – The applicant has proposed eight in square cedar columns. Given the proposed height and porch massing, staff finds the proposed columns to feature an appropriate size; however, each column should feature both a capital and base.

o. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 6., all mechanical equipment should be screened from view at the public right of way. The applicant is responsible for complying with this.

p. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed to install a concrete, ribbon strip driveway on the east side of the lot. The proposed location is consistent with the examples found on this block of Center Street. The applicant should ensure that the proposed curb cut and apron are consistent with the historic profiles found on this block. Additionally, the proposed driveway should not exceed ten (10) feet in width.

q. SIDEWALK – There currently is an existing front sidewalk on the property. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 5. A.ii. historic sidewalks should be retained and repaired in place. Additionally, the proposed new construction should be centered on the existing sidewalk, consistent with the historic examples found on the block and throughout the District.

r. CARPORT – At the rear of the lot, the applicant has proposed to construct a carport to feature covered parking for two automobiles. The proposed carport is to feature twenty (20) feet in length and width. Staff finds the general size and location of the proposed carports appropriate; however, the applicant should provide additional information regarding materials and details.

s. LANDSCAPING – At this time, the applicant has not provided a landscaping plan noting landscaping materials. Staff finds that a landscaping plan noting proposed landscaping materials should be submitted when returning to the HDRC for final approval.

t. FENCING – The applicant has noted in the application documents that a cattle panel fence is to be installed to replace the existing, wrought iron fence. Staff finds the proposed fence appropriate. This fence should not exceed four (4) feet in height.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings a through t with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant proposed a foundation height that is consistent with the Guidelines and historic examples found on this block of Center as noted in finding g.
- ii. That the applicant provide a street elevation and additional massing information to determine the new construction's impact on the neighboring historic structures.
- iii. That the applicant incorporate window openings that are consistent with the Guidelines as noted in finding i.
- iv. That the applicant install wood windows that are to include traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details as noted in finding l.
- v. That the applicant provide a column detail noting the installation of a capital and base as noted in finding n.
- vi. That the applicant screen all mechanical equipment as noted in finding o.
- vii. That the applicant maintain the existing front yard sidewalk and that the proposed new construction be centered on the sidewalk as noted in finding q.
- viii. That the applicant install a driveway that is ten (10) feet in width.
- vii. That the applicant provide a landscaping plan noting landscaping materials as noted in finding s.
- viii. That the applicant provide additional information regarding the proposed carport's materials as noted in finding r.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Liz Franklin & Johnathan Engleton spoke in opposition to the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to move for denial of conceptual.

AYES: Guarino, Conner, Laffoon, Cone, Kamal, Garcia, Grube, Brittain, Lazarine

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

May 17, 2017

23. HDRC CASE NO. 2017-221

Applicant: Felix Ziga/Studio Ziga

Address: 819 DAWSON ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Remove the existing, non-historic front deck and non-historic siding and repair all wood features in kind to match the existing.
2. Remove the existing concrete flatwork at the rear of the property, repair the front sidewalk and concrete porch and install a concrete ribbon driveway.
3. Install a (4) foot tall hog wire fence in the front yard and install a six (6) foot tall privacy fence in the rear yard.
4. Remove the non-historic enclosed porch at the rear of the property and construct a new addition with a standing seam metal roof and board and batten siding.
5. Construct a new metal carport.
6. Install a cement plaster foundation skirting.
7. Replace the non-historic aluminum windows with new, vinyl windows.
8. Receive Historic Tax Certification.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 819 Dawson Street was constructed circa 1910 and is located in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The structure was constructed in the Folk Victorian style and features many modifications including the removal of the original wood windows, the construction of a front deck and rear addition, the installation of a concrete porch and the installation of non-original siding.
- b. EXTERIOR MAINTENANCE – The applicant has proposed to remove the existing, non-historic front deck and non-historic siding as well as repair the concrete front porch and all wood features in kind to match the existing. The proposed repair work is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations.
- c. FOUNDATION SKIRTING – The historic structure currently does not feature foundation skirting. The applicant has proposed to install a cement plaster foundation skirting. Folk Victorian structures throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District typically feature foundation skirting composed of wood that matches the profile of the siding. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 8.B.i. notes that replacement skirting should consist of durable, proven materials and should either match the existing siding or be applied to have minimal visual impact. Staff finds that the proposed cement plaster skirting is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the installation of either wood or Hardi board skirting that features a matching profile.
- d. FENCING – The applicant has proposed to install a front yard cedar and hog wire fence to feature four (4) feet in height as well as a cedar privacy fence in the rear yard to feature six (6) feet in height. This block of Dawson features front yard fences, including an existing wood picket fence at this property. The proposed fences are consistent with the Guidelines; however, the applicant is to submit a fencing detail to staff prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- e. SIDEWALK AND DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed to repair the existing front yard sidewalk and install a ribbon strip driveway. The proposed driveway is to be installed in the location of the existing, historic driveway. The applicant has proposed to install decomposed granite between the proposed ribbon strips. Staff finds the proposed driveway appropriate; however, the applicant should install a driveway that is no wider than ten (10) feet in width.
- f. ADDITION – At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct an addition in the location of an existing, non-original enclosed porch. The removal of the non-original enclosed porch is eligible for administrative approval. The proposed rear addition is to feature 193 square feet. The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. states that additions should be sited to minimize visual impact from the public right of way, should be designed to be in keeping with the historic context of the block, should utilize a similar roof form and should feature a transition between the old and the new. The applicant has proposed for the addition to include a shed roof, both side and rear setbacks from the existing wall planes, a standing seam metal roof and board and batten siding. The proposed roof shall feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish. Additionally, the board and batten siding shall feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½” wide.
- g. SCALE, MASS AND FORM – Regarding scale, mass and form, the applicant has proposed for the addition to feature a roof height that is subordinate to that of the primary historic structure, a width that is subordinate to that of the primary historic structure and a footprint that is appropriate for the footprint of the historic structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.
- h. MATERIALS – As noted above, the applicant has proposed board and batten siding as well as a standing seam metal roof. The applicant has also proposed to install vinyl windows. Staff finds that the applicant should provide specifics for the proposed vinyl windows including a product specification sheet, material sample and detailed wall section noting the dimensions of the proposed framing depth.
- i. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The existing historic structure currently features aluminum windows. The

May 17, 2017

applicant has proposed to remove the existing aluminum windows and install new, vinyl windows. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 2.B.vii. state that non-historic incompatible windows should be replaced with windows that are typical of the architectural style of the building. The proposed vinyl windows are not consistent with windows that are architecturally appropriate and original to the historic structure. Staff recommends the installation of wood windows that are consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, Window Policy Document as noted in finding n that are to include traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details

j. CARPORT CONSTRUCTION – At the rear of the property, the applicant has proposed to construct carport featuring a structure consisting of treated pine and a corrugated galvalume roof. The proposed carport is to feature covered parking for two vehicles. Staff finds the proposed carport appropriate.

k. HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION – HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION – The requirements for Tax Certification outlined in UDC Section 35-618 have been met and the applicant has provided evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer including photographs and an itemized list of costs.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #5 and #8 with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant install a driveway that does not exceed ten (10) feet in width as noted in finding e.
- ii. That the applicant submit a fencing detail of the hog wire fence to staff as noted in finding d.
- iii. That the addition's proposed standing seam metal roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish and that the board and batten siding be wood or Hardi board and feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½" wide as noted in finding f.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #6 with the stipulation that the applicant install a wood or a Hardi board siding as noted in finding c.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #7 based on finding i. Staff recommends the installation of wood windows that are consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, Window Policy Document as noted in finding n that are to include traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to move for approval based on changes agreed to by applicant with staff stipulations and that applicant come back to staff for approval of the window profile.

AYES: Guarino, Conner, Laffoon, Cone, Kamal, Garcia, Grube, Brittain, Lazarine

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

24. HDRC CASE NO. 2017-228

Applicant: Bernice Beck

Address: 223 W HOLLYWOOD AVE

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

25. HDRC CASE NO. 2017-228

Applicant: Matt and Amanda Holmes

Address: 301 W HOLLYWOOD AVE

POSTPONED BY APPLICANT

26. HDRC CASE NO. 2017-110

Applicant: Mark Sembera

May 17, 2017

Address: 313 E MISTLETOE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Remove a rear non-original addition.
2. Add a covered addition (260 square feet) to the rear of the property, to include the extension and replacement of the original galvanized standing seam roofline to cover the addition. The addition will feature woodlap siding and paint to match existing structure with a vertical trim piece to distinguish from the primary structure.
3. Add a French door and salvaged interior window to the addition.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure located at 313 E. Mistletoe is one-story single family home with Craftsman style elements. It is a contributing structure in the pending Tobin Hill North Historic District. Per UDC Sec. 35-453, when a pending district is recommended by the commission for designation, property owners shall follow the historic and design review process until a final resolution from City Council is made. The applicant has proposed to remove an existing non-original rear addition and extend the primary roofline to the rear to add a new addition.
- b. The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on March 21, 2017 and April 25, 2017. The March 21 meeting considered a proposal that removed the smaller subordinate rear gable by extending the rear roofline and demolishing the smaller rear gable in its entirety. This smaller gable was determined to be a character defining feature of the home. Concerns included distinguishing the original structure from the addition by use of material, the structural feasibility of the roof proposal, and how the addition will affect the public right-of-way. The applicant returned to the DRC in April with a modified proposal that retained the subordinate rear gable. This proposal, which matches that submitted for consideration at the HDRC hearing on May 17, extends the primary gable and integrates it with the northeast corner of the subordinate gable. All other material will remain. The DRC was in support of this proposal, but emphasized the need for clearer exhibits, including elevations from all sides, an existing and new floor and roof plan, additional photos of the structure to be impacted, and a full set of materials in order to make a final determination at the hearing. These exhibits were received on May 10, 2017.
- c. REMOVAL OF EXISTING MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed to remove existing siding, a door, an interior window, and an 8-pane window from the rear façade of the structure. The portion of the structure proposed for removal is an addition added after the original construction date, which is confirmed from Sanborn Maps research. Staff finds the proposal acceptable and consistent with the guidelines.
- d. ROOF– The proposal includes extending the existing primary rear roofline towards the rear to add additional interior square footage. Presently, a smaller and subordinate gable structure exists at the northeast corner of the addition. Staff and the DRC have determined this element to be a character defining feature of the style of the home. A previous proposal by the applicant proposed removing this element. The present proposal will retain the existing gable structure by integrating the extended roofline into the northwest corner of the rear gable, and retaining the remaining form and material as is. However, the north elevation indicates that the subordinate gable will be concealed from view with new wood plank siding. Staff finds the overall addition proposal generally acceptable, but does not find the concealing of a character defining feature consistent with the guidelines.
- e. HEIGHT - According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions 1.B.v and 2.B.i, the height of an addition should be limited to the height of the original structure. The proposed height of the addition is no larger than the existing structure and will not be obtrusive to the visual from the public right-of-way. Staff finds the proposal consistent with these guidelines.
- f. MATERIAL TRANSITIONS – According to the Historic Design Guidelines, additions should provide a clear visual distinction between old and new forms. The applicant received an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness to remove non-original asbestos siding and to restore existing original wood lap siding underneath. The applicant has proposed to use woodlap siding with a 6” profile on the new addition as an extension of the current material conditions, with a vertical trim piece on the sides to indicate where the addition begins relative to the existing structure. Staff finds the material consistent with the guidelines but finds the 6” profile incompatible with the exterior structure.
- g. FENESTRATION MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to reuse an existing original interior wood window to be removed for the addition in the rear elevation of the addition. Additionally, the applicant has proposed to add a French door to the rear of the existing structure. The doors will not be visible from the public right-of-way and will be made of wood. Staff finds the proposal acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Staff recommends approval of the existing addition removal based on findings a through c.
2. Staff recommends approval of the addition and roofline extension based on findings a through g with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the siding be removed from the gable of the rear addition so the existing subordinate gable is visible. The applicant must submit final drawings to staff for approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

May 17, 2017

- ii. That the woodlap siding on the addition match the profile of the existing woodlap siding.
 - iii. That the new standing seam roof follow the Checklist for Metal Roofs in the Historic Design Guidelines. The roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish.
3. Staff recommends approval of the French door installation and salvaged window installation based on finding g.

CASE COMMENTS:

The applicant met with the Design Review Commission (DRC) on March 21 and April 25, 2017. The discussions are outlined in finding b.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Frederica Kushner & Rick Schell spoke in support of the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor approval as submitted the chimney will be retained.

AYES: Guarino, Conner, Laffoon, Cone, Kamal, Garcia, Grube, Brittain, Lazarine

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

27. HDRC CASE NO. 2017-207

Applicant: Tyler Sibley/Pursuant Ventures

Address: 325 W MISTLETOE

POSTPONED BY APPLICANT

28. HDRC CASE NO. 2017-195

Applicant: Bernardo Serra-Oliven

Address: 417 E EVERGREEN

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

- 1. Enclose one existing front doorway with siding.
- 2. Demolish non-original single-story rear addition and porch.
- 3. Construct a new two-story rear porch.
- 4. Demolish a non-original single-story rear accessory structure.
- 5. Construct a new two-story rear accessory structure to include garage and second story apartment.
- 6. Modify front steps, walkway, and driveway.

FINDINGS:

- a. The property located at 417 E Evergreen is a two-story single family home constructed in 1910 and designed in the Craftsman style with Prairie influences. The house features third story attic with a hipped roof, decorative brackets, and three windows with twelve lites each, as well as an arched second story window with original wood detailing. The house is a contributing structure in the Tobin Hill Historic District. The property also contains a single-story storage shed in the rear of the lot, which is neither original nor contributing to the district. The applicant has proposed an ample rehabilitation to the primary structure, including wood window repair, the removal of non-original asbestos siding, rehabilitation of concealed existing woodlap siding, the enclosure of one of two front doors with new woodlap siding, the relocation of one front window, the demolition both the existing front and rear porch, and the construction of a new one-story front porch and new two-story rear porch. The applicant has also proposed to demolish the non-contributing rear accessory structure, construct a new two-story rear accessory structure, install a new rear driveway and curb cut, and modify the existing front walkway configuration.
- b. HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION – As of the May 17 hearing, the applicant has not applied for Historic Tax Certification. Based on the scope of the project, staff recommends that the applicant apply for this incentive. Findings for primary structure, items #1 through #7:
- c. FRONT DOOR MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to enclose one of two existing front doors with siding and retain the door opening that is on center with the front elevation. In a photograph dating to the 2003 Tobin Hill Historic District survey, both front doors are pictured in the present configuration. However, both the 1912 and 1951 Sanborn Maps indicate a single family dwelling with a different front porch. Staff conducted a site visit on May 10, 2017 and noticed that the two doors had a different trim detail and profile. The second door was

May 17, 2017

likely added to accommodate a multifamily residence after sometime after 1951. Staff finds returning the front opening to a single family configuration acceptable.

d. REAR ADDITION AND PORCH REMOVAL – The applicant has proposed to demolish an existing one-story enclosed rear addition and porch. Both the 1912 and 1951 Sanborn Maps indicate one-story rear porch in a different location with a much smaller footprint. The addition and porch are also constructed of materials that are non-original to the structure and incompatible with the style and materiality of the primary structure. Staff finds the removal of both the addition and porch acceptable.

e. NEW TWO-STORY REAR PORCH – The applicant has proposed to construct a new two-story rear porch. The porch will be open on both levels and feature posts that are similar to size and scale as the existing single-story porch posts, measuring approximately 4x4” in width. The material will be painted wood and feature a simple baluster railing with 1x1” posts. Staff has not yet received updated drawings that confirm these plans.

Findings for accessory structure, items #8 and #9:

f. DEMOLITION OF ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – The applicant has proposed to demolish an existing one-story accessory structure in the rear of the property. The structure is non-original and non-contributing to the district. Staff finds its removal acceptable.

g. FOOTPRINT – The applicant as proposed to construct a new two-story accessory structure along the west lot line, slightly closer to the primary structure than the existing accessory structure. The proposed footprint measures 25’-8” by 21’-8”, or approximately 550 square feet. The Historic Design Guidelines for Additions stipulate that new garages and outbuildings should be less than 40% the size of the primary structure in plan. The proposed footprint eclipses 50% of the size of the primary structure. However, large outbuildings, garages, and accessory structures are common in the Tobin Hill Historic District, particularly in the close vicinity of 417 E Evergreen. The structure is also an appropriate footprint for the size of the lot. Staff finds the proposal acceptable.

h. ORIENTATION – The applicant has proposed to construct a new accessory structure that will be oriented towards E Evergreen. Guideline 5.B.i for new construction stipulates that new garages and outbuildings should follow the historic orientation common in the district. Rear garages with access from the primary street are common in the vicinity and staff finds the proposal consistent with the guidelines.

i. SETBACK – The applicant has indicated that the west façade of the new accessory structure will be offset by 3’ from the side setback. Guideline 5.B.ii for new construction stipulates that setbacks should be reflective of those common in the district. A minimum of 5’ should be incorporated from any lot line. The proposal as submitted is inconsistent with the guidelines and UDC standards and would require a variance.

j. SCALE – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing one story rear garage with a new two-story garage with a second story apartment. The Historic Design Guidelines state that new construction should be consistent with the height and overall scale of nearby historic buildings. Rear two story structures are common along this block in the Tobin Hill North Historic District based on staff observation. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the guidelines.

k. FENESTRATION: GARAGE DOORS – The applicant has proposed to install a garage door on the front elevation of the structure. The garage door will be new wood carriage doors with sixteen panels each on each side. Staff finds the proposed garage door material and size acceptable and compatible with the style of the home.

l. FENESTRATION: WINDOWS AND DOORS – The applicant has proposed to install three windows on the second story of both the front and rear elevation of the structure. The windows will incorporate wood bracketing and trim that echoes the primary architectural detailing of the house. Additionally, one door will be installed on the front elevation and the east side elevation. The west elevation is void of fenestration. The applicant should also ensure that window and door openings are incorporated on every façade. The applicant should refer to the Historic Design Guidelines and the OHP Window Policy document to ensure that appropriate window materials and an appropriate framing depth is used. Staff finds the installation of wood windows to be appropriate.

m. MATERIALITY: WALLS – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, new construction should incorporate materials that complement the type, color, and texture of materials traditionally found in the district. The applicant has proposed the use siding for the new accessory structure, but has not yet specified the material or profile, or if it will match that of the primary structure.

n. MATERIALITY: WINDOWS AND DOORS – The applicant has indicated that the trim of the windows and doors will be wood to match the size and detailing of the primary structure. However, the applicant has not specified the material of the windows and doors, nor provided detailed specifications on their installation.

o. ROOF DETAILS – The applicant has proposed a hipped roof using shingles to match the primary structure. Staff finds the proposal appropriate and consistent with the guidelines.

Findings for site modifications, item #6:

p. FRONT WALKWAY MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to reconfigure the front steps and walkway. The concrete front steps will be re-poured and reduced from four steps to three, and the front walkway will be altered from an angular approach to the side drive to a horizontal approach. Staff has not yet received updated drawings that confirm these plans.

q. DRIVEWAY MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to extend the existing concrete driveway into the rear of the lot to provide access to the new garage. The driveway will be extended approximately 20 feet in the same width as the existing driveway, and then widen to 18 inches for the remaining 10 feet of the driveway. Staff has not yet received updated drawings that confirm these plans.

RECOMMENDATION:

May 17, 2017

1. Staff recommends approval of the removal of a front door based on findings a and c.
 2. Staff recommends approval of the demolition of the non-original rear addition and porch based on finding d.
 3. Staff recommends conceptual approval of a new two-story rear porch based on findings d and e. The applicant should return with a finalized proposal at a subsequent hearing for final approval.
 4. Staff recommends approval of the demolition of a non-original single-story rear accessory structure based on finding f.
 5. Staff recommends conceptual approval of the construction of a new two-story rear accessory structure based on findings g with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the applicant incorporates openings on all facades of the structure that are consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, the OHP Window Policy document, and opening sizes of similar accessory structures in the district. The applicant must submit specifications for windows and doors for final approval.
 - ii. That the applicant specifies a wall material for the structure for final approval.
 - iii. That the applicant submits updated drawings prior to receiving final approval.
 - iv. That the applicant complies with all city zoning and land use regulations.
- Staff does not recommend approval of the site modifications at this time based on findings p through q. The applicant should resubmit with dimensions plans and a landscaping plan that reflect the up-to-date intentions of the project.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Frederica Kushner spoke in support of the applicant's request.

APPLICANT NOT PRESENT

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor move to next agenda

AYES: Guarino, Conner, Laffoon, Cone, Kamal, Garcia, Grube, Brittain, Lazarine

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

29. HDRC CASE NO. 2017-208

Applicant: Joseph Cotton

Address: 103 E HUISACHE AVE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting final approval to:

1. Construct a 1-story addition on the west side of the primary structure, measuring approximately 60 square feet.
2. Construct a 1-story addition on the east side of the primary structure, measuring approximately 88 square feet,
3. Construct a 2-story addition to north/rear side of the primary structure, measuring approximately 160 square feet, enclosing an existing 1-story rear covered patio.
4. Modify existing fenestration on primary structure to accommodate additions.
5. Construct a 2nd story, approximately 800 square feet, on an existing 1-story rear accessory structure.
6. Modify the existing wall/gate of the rear accessory structure fronting Main Avenue.

FINDINGS:

a. The home is a two-story Spanish eclectic home with stucco siding, clay tile roof, front gable, and existing front porch with arched openings and wrought iron details. It is at the corner of Main Ave and E Huisache Ave. The home was built circa 1922 and is a contributing structure in the Monte Vista Historic District. The accessory structure is a single-story garage with a flat roof and is also a contributing structure in the Monte Vista Historic District. Both the primary and accessory structure first appear on a Sanborn Map in 1924 in the same location and with the same footprint.

b. The applicant was heard for a similar but different proposal by the HDRC on December 21, 2016. The case was deferred to the Design Review Committee (DRC). The applicant met with the DRC on January 11, 2017 and March 21, 2017. Comments from both meetings include concerns regarding footprint on the lot, clarity of information, distinction of textures between additions versus original elements, and the height required in the guidelines to be limited to no more than 40% of the height of the original structure, particularly in relation to the garage addition proposal. Since that time, the new proposal includes modifications to: the roof form on the garage addition; the awnings on the garage addition; the roof form on the west addition to the primary structure; the form of the proposed gate; the siding of the east addition to the primary structure and its roof form; the awning and railing of the interior side of the garage addition; and the open stair case on the garage addition.

Findings for Main House, Items #1 through #4:

c. FOOTPRINT – The May 1924 Sanborn shows that the covered patio is not original to the home, though the rear left corner is. The two 1-story additions are bump outs from the existing structure. The rear addition modifies the original rear covered patio by enclosing it as part of the condition building envelope and adding a second story atop. The additions to the main structure include a total combined footprint of approximately 308 square feet as indicated in the submitted drawings. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.iv., residential additions

May 17, 2017

should not double the footprint of the original primary structure. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

d. **SCALE AND FORM: WEST ELEVATION** – Two of the proposed additions on the two-story primary structure are one-story. The one-story addition facing Main Ave (west) has a simplified flat roof and a decorative parapet that is complementary to the primary structure in its design and form. The parapet is Spanish Eclectic in form and does not detract from the primary structure's distinctive design elements. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.i, additions should be designed to be subordinate to the principal façade. The proposed addition is set back from the front façade and subordinate to the main structure in scale and in height. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

e. **SCALE AND FORM: EAST ELEVATION** – The one-story addition to the east elevation, which is not visible from the public right-of-way, is similar in scale and footprint to the west addition. The addition has a hipped roof with clay tile to match the existing primary gable. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.ii., similar roof forms, pitches, and overhangs should be used on additions. Staff finds the hipped roof form and material is compatible and appropriate for the architectural style of the home.

f. **SCALE AND FORM: NORTH (REAR) ELEVATION** – The rear 2-story addition to the rear has a hipped roof that is below the ridge of the existing rear gable. The Guidelines for Additions stipulate that According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.ii., similar roof forms, pitches, and overhangs should be used on additions. Staff finds the hipped roof form is compatible and appropriate for the architectural style of the home.

g. **FENESTRATION MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING STRUCTURE** – The additions to the primary structure require the removal of existing windows and a door to accommodate new interior conditioned space. A rear door on the first floor will be removed, as well as two rear windows from the second floor. Most material to be removed for the additions is wall space currently void of fenestration. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i, existing openings should be preserved, and creating new primary entrances or window openings on the primary façade or where visible from the public right-of-way should be avoided. These modifications are located on the rear elevation and do not detract from the view from the public right-of-way or the overall fenestration composition of the home. Staff finds the modifications acceptable.

h. **NEW FENESTRATION: DOORS** – The proposed additions on the main house include three sets of double doors each with full lights, two single doors each with a full light, and wood 3' x 6' doors with full lites. According to the Guidelines for Additions 4.A.ii., the addition should incorporate architectural details that are in keeping with the style of the original structure. Ensure that new entrances, when necessary to comply with other regulations, are compatible in size, scale, shape, proportion, material, and massing with historic entrances. Staff generally finds the proposed doors are characteristic of the original structure. The door pattern on the east addition contains a significant amount of glass versus the rest of the structure. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions 4.A.iii, additions should consider integrating contemporary interpretations of traditional designs and details to help convey that an addition is new. Given the location of the east addition, as well as the comparable size of the doors relative to the historic openings, staff finds the proposal acceptable.

i. **NEW FENESTRATION: WINDOWS** - The proposed additions contain seven wood one over one windows with same profile as existing, as well as a fixed window measuring 1'-6" by 11" in size. Two of the one over one windows are located on the one-story west addition facing Main Ave, and five are located on the north (rear) addition on the second floor. The fixed window is located on the second floor of the north addition facing east towards a balcony and the interior of the property. According to the Guidelines for Additions, architectural details should keep with the architectural style of the original structure. Staff finds the one over one windows consistent with the guidelines, but finds the 1'-6" by 11" fixed window inconsistent and incompatible with the historic structure.

j. **TRANSITION/MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed to differentiate the wall material of the additions by using a medium texture stucco without the swirl pattern of the existing structure. The new stucco will match the existing stucco color as closely as possible. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iv., the addition should feature a visual distinction between old and new building forms, whether it is an offset of the material or an architectural element. Also, guidelines stipulate the use of materials that are compatible with the primary structure. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the guidelines and appropriate for the home.

Findings for Rear Garage, Item #5:

k. **REAR GARAGE** – The existing accessory is a one-story garage set behind the main residential house. The garage is accessible from the side street on Main Ave. The structure is contributing to the district, is made of stucco, and features a flat roof.

l. **SETBACKS** – The existing garage has a rear setback of 9' and a side setback of 0'. The proposed addition has a rear setback of 0'. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.B.ii., historic setback pattern of similar structures along the block should be followed. In this instance, historic setbacks are not consistent with UDC requirements and a variance is required. Staff finds that the proposed setbacks are consistent with the historical development pattern along the block.

m. **SCALE AND MASS** – The existing garage structure is one-story and is approximately 680 square feet. The proposed addition creates a two-story structure and adds approximately 800 square feet. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.i, additions should be designed to be visually subordinate to the principal structure in terms of their height, massing, and form. Staff finds that the addition does not overwhelm or visually compete with the main structure. However, the Guidelines for Additions stipulate that an addition's footprint should not double that of the existing structure. The proposed square footage represents a 120% increase in square footage.

May 17, 2017

Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the guidelines.

n. ROOF FORM - The existing roofline of the one-story garage is flat. The proposed 2nd story addition is flat with an elevated metal gabled element that houses a semi-outdoor staircase facing into the property. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.ii., similar roof forms, pitches, and overhangs should be used on additions. Staff finds the proposed flat form consistent with the guidelines but finds the elevated element inconsistent with the developmental patterns of the historic district.

o. TRANSITION/MATERIALS – The proposed addition will utilize hardi plank siding to be 6” in profile, with the smooth side exposed. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iv., the addition should feature a visual distinction between old and new building forms, whether it is an offset of the material or an architectural element. The guidelines also stipulate to use materials that are compatible with the existing structure. Staff finds the proposed hardi siding generally compatible with the existing structure, as well as the surrounding context of the district, but has not received any detailing on how these planks will be affixed structurally, what the vertical structural pieces are in terms of materiality, and the specifications of the planks themselves, including profile or color.

p. WINDOWS AND DOORS – The proposed additions include wood one over one windows with same profile as existing on the accessory, four sets of double doors each with full lights, one single door with a full light, and five 2’-1/2” by 1’-2” rectangular windows on the primary elevation facing Main Ave. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i, window and door openings should have a similar proportion of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades. Staff finds the proposed doors and one over one window and doors are characteristic of the original structure, but finds the 2’-1/2” by 1’-2” windows incompatible in size for the style of the garage and its relationship to the primary structure. These windows are also not consistent with historic window sizes in the district.

q. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – The addition features a second story balcony with wrought iron railing and horizontal awning system. According to the Guidelines for Additions 4.A.ii., the addition should incorporate architectural details that are in keeping with the style of the original structure but an element reflective of its time. Staff finds the use of an awning consistent with the guidelines, but finds the introduction of a metal element incompatible with the existing materials of the primary and accessory structure. The submitted proposal also does not indicate information on the specific material or finish of the brise soliel element.

r. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – The existing rooftop mechanical equipment on the one-story garage would be relocated to the flat portion of the roof of the proposed 2-story addition. According to the Guidelines for Additions 5.B.ii., roof-mounted equipment should be screened and set back to avoid view from the public right-of-way. Though it would be toward the rear, the applicant did not provide details of screening or show that the equipment would not be seen.

Findings for privacy wall, Item #6:

s. WALL MODIFICATIONS – The existing privacy wall fronting Main Ave is finished in the same stucco pattern as the primary structure. The wall includes a wooden rectangular door inset from the public right-of-way for use as a functional gate, as well three rectangular cut-outs with decorative screens. The wall steps down in height from the garage three times as it approaches the intersection of Main Ave and E Huisache in response to the change in slope. The applicant is proposing to extend the height of the wall above the existing door to match the height of the existing 1-story garage, approximately 11 feet from grade. The proposal also includes a curved stepdown to meet the original height which mimics the detailing of the west addition to the primary structure. The added height to meet the level of the existing garage would nearly double the height of the existing privacy wall. While the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements do not stipulate a maximum height for privacy walls, they should follow the developmental pattern of the surrounding district. Additionally, the UDC stipulates that privacy walls and fences on residential lots facing local streets should not be taller than 6 feet. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the guidelines and UDC requirements.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Staff recommends approval of the 1-story addition based on findings a through j.
2. Staff recommends approval of the 1-story addition based on findings a through j.
3. Staff recommends approval of the 2-story addition based on findings a through j with the stipulation that the proposed fixed window measuring 1’-6” by 11” be replaced with a window size that is more consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, OHP Window Policy document, and the historic fenestration sizes of the primary structure.
4. Staff recommends the fenestration modifications based on findings a through g.
5. Staff does not recommend approval of the 2-story garage addition at this time based on findings k through r.
6. Staff does not recommend approval of the wall and gate modifications as submitted based on finding s.

CASE COMMENTS:

- The applicant was heard for a similar but different proposal by the HDRC on December 21, 2016. The case was deferred to the Design Review Committee (DRC).
- The applicant met with the DRC on January 11, 2017 and March 21, 2017. Comments from both meetings are outlined in finding b.
- Per the case comments from the HDRC case heard December 21, 2016, historic setbacks are not consistent with UDC requirements and a variance is required from the Development Services Department.

May 17, 2017

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Manuela Shannon, Paul Kinnison, John Tanner & Madeline Proctor spoke in opposition to the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Garcia denial with staff recommendations

AYES: Guarino, Conner, Laffoon, Cone, Kamal, Garcia, Grube, Brittain, Lazarine

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

COMMISSIONER BRITTAIN LEFT THE MEETING AT 8:00 PM.

30. HDRC CASE NO. 2017-205

Applicant: Andrew Holbrook

Address: 531 E HUISACHE AVE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Construct a rear addition to the primary structure.
2. Remove three existing rear windows and a rear door and reuse windows in the addition where feasible.
3. Repair existing wood windows and replace with new wood windows if deteriorated beyond repair.
4. Repair existing wood lap siding and replace in-kind as necessary.
5. Replace a portion of the composition roof shingles with new shingles to match existing.
6. Demolish an existing 1-story accessory structure.
7. Construct a new 2-story accessory structure.

FINDINGS:

a. The property located at 531 E Huisache is a single family home designed in the Craftsman style. The house features several quintessential Craftsman elements, including exposed roof rafter tails, a deep asymmetrical porch, and front columns with sloping sides. The house is a contributing structure in the Monte Vista Historic District. The applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition to the primary structure, demolish an existing accessory structure, construct a new detached two story garage, replace existing windows with new vinyl clad windows, replace existing siding with new wood lap siding, and replace existing composition roof shingles with new singles to match existing.

b. The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on April 26, 2017. The committee members agreed that the new addition's roof form was an acceptable approach given the visual distinction between the addition and original structure achieved with the vertical trim piece. The DRC was also comfortable with the use of new hardi siding on the addition as long as the profile was close to 5 ½ inches instead of 8 inches. The DRC recommended the repair of existing wood windows, and the use of new wood windows to match original details when required, per the historic design guidelines. The committee recommended salvaging the rear windows to be removed in the new addition and, if necessary, relocating these salvaged windows to the original structure if an existing window was deemed deteriorated beyond repair. The DRC also recommended that the applicant submit a window schedule indicating where new windows will be used in both the original structure and addition. At the time of the meeting, no photos of the existing accessory structure had been provided, so the DRC could not comment on if demolition would be acceptable. Regarding the proposed new 2-story accessory structure, the DRC recommended that the small 2x2' windows be deleted and windows that comply with the OHP Window Policy document be introduced. They also recommended that a trim piece be added between the two rectangular windows, similar to the existing window pattern on the primary structure. The DRC also recommended that the roof dormers be deleted.

Findings for primary structure, items #1 through #5:

c. **MASSING AND FOOTPRINT** – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition to the primary structure. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, additions should be located at the rear of the property whenever possible. Additionally, the guidelines stipulate that additions should not double the size of the primary structure. The addition is approximately a fourth of the overall size of the existing home. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the guidelines.

d. **ROOF** – The proposed addition will modify the existing rear roofline to accommodate the new addition. The modification will mimic the existing rear roof slope while create two side hipped gables that echo existing the existing hipped gables located on the sides of the structure. The applicant has also proposed to utilize the same sizing and roofing materials as the existing structure in the addition. The Historic Design Guidelines for Additions state that new additions should utilize a similar roof pitch, form, and orientation as the principal structure. Staff finds the proposed roof form consistent with the guidelines.

May 17, 2017

- e. **FENESTRATION MODIFICATIONS** – The proposed addition will require the removal of three existing wood windows and one existing rear door. The applicant has proposed to salvage and reuse the existing wood windows where feasible in the addition. Guideline 3.C.i in the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions encourages the salvage and reuse of historic materials, where possible, that will be covered or removed as a result of an addition. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the guidelines.
- f. **WINDOW REPAIR AND REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to repair existing wood windows in place. If individual units are deteriorated beyond repair, the applicant as proposed to replace with new wood windows to match the existing. As assessed from the photos provided in the application, existing wood windows are in good condition and are repairable. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, wood windows that are more than 50% in tact should be repaired, and when replacement is required, should be replaced in-kind. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the guidelines.
- g. **EXISTING SIDING REPAIR AND REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to restore the existing wood lap siding and repair with new wood lap siding to match the profile and dimension of the original when required. The existing wood lap siding is in good condition and is repairable based on the photos submitted with the application. According to the guidelines, siding should be repaired in place where feasible, and replaced in-kind when deteriorated beyond repair. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the guidelines.
- h. **PARTIAL ROOF REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to replace a portion of the existing composite shingle roof with shingles to match existing. The guidelines stipulate that when roof replacement is required, the replacement should be done in-kind. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the guidelines.
- i. **NEW ADDITION SIDING** – The applicant has proposed to distinguish the addition from the original structure by utilizing hardi board siding on the addition. The profile will be approximately 8 ½ inches. The existing original woodlap siding at approximately 3 inches. According to guideline 2.A.v for additions, side of rear additions should utilize setbacks, a small change in detailing, or a detail at the seam of the historic structure and addition to provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms. The 8 ½” inch profile of the hardi siding is a much larger profile than the existing wood lap siding on the primary structure and is not appropriate for the proposed addition. Staff does not find the hardi material and profile consistent with the guidelines.
- j. **NEW ADDITION TRIM PIECE** – The applicant has proposed to install a vertical trim piece at the joint of the original structure and the new addition. According to guideline 2.A.v for additions, side of rear additions should utilize setbacks, a small change in detailing, or a detail at the seam of the historic structure and addition to provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the guidelines and appropriate for this particular addition given the integrated nature of the addition’s roof form. Findings for accessory structure, items #6 and #7:
- k. **DEMOLITION OF ACCESSORY STRUCTURE** – The applicant has proposed to demolish an existing one-story accessory structure in the rear of the property. The structure is noted as contributing. The structure is in a state of disrepair, including severe differential settlement, punching failures in the roofline, buckling of vertical support elements, rotting of wood siding, and fire damage, as indicated in documentation provided by the applicant. The structure would require substantial stabilization and partial reconstruction. Staff has asked the applicant if reconstructing the accessory structure is an option, but the applicant has elected to pursue a new build due to financial feasibility and the existing structure’s state of disrepair. Staff finds the proposal acceptable with stipulations as listed in the recommendations.
- l. **FOOTPRINT** – The applicant as proposed to construct a new accessory structure in the same location as the existing accessory structure. The proposed footprint closely matches the width of the existing structure. The Historic Design Guidelines for Additions stipulate that new garages and outbuildings should be less than 40% the size of the primary structure in plan. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the guidelines.
- m. **ORIENTATION AND SETBACK** – The applicant has proposed to construct a new accessory structure in the same orientation as the existing structure. Guidelines 5.B.i and 5.B.ii for new construction stipulate that new garages and outbuildings should follow the historic orientation and setbacks common in the district. Staff finds the proposal for orientation consistent with the guidelines but has not seen a site plan indicating how the new footprint will affect the setback from the rear or adjacent lot.
- n. **SCALE** – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing one story rear garage with a new two-story garage with a second story apartment. The Historic Design Guidelines state that new construction should be consistent with the height and overall scale of nearby historic buildings. The applicant has not yet provided evidence that two story rear garages are common in nearby historic lots or the Monte Vista Historic District.
- o. **FENESTRATION** – The applicant has proposed to install several 2x2’ square fixed windows in the accessory structure. According to the OHP Window Policy Document, windows used in new construction should maintain traditional dimensions and profiles found on the primary structure or within the historic district. Staff finds the use of 2x2’ square windows inconsistent with the guidelines.
- p. **MATERIALITY** – The applicant has proposed the use of hardi board with a 5 ½” profile for the new garage siding. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, new construction should incorporate materials that complement the type, color, and texture of materials traditionally found in the district. Additionally, guideline 3.A.ii also states that new construction should incorporate salvaged historic materials where possible, and guideline 3.B encourages the use of traditional materials, such as wood siding, in a new way to provide visual interest while still ensuring compatibility. The existing accessory structure, while deteriorated, contains portions of original woodlap siding that may be salvaged and incorporated into the new garage to provide visual interest while ensuring historic continuity. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the guidelines considering the potential opportunity to salvage existing materials from the original rear accessory structure.

May 17, 2017

q. **ROOF DETAILS** – The applicant has proposed a shed roof with two shed dormers facing the public right-of-way. The guidelines stipulate that architectural details of new construction should keep with the predominant architectural style along the block face or within the district when one exists. Details should also be simple in design and should complement, but not visually compete with, the primary structure or adjacent structures, and details more ornate than those found on the primary structure should be avoided. Staff finds the use of dormers incompatible with the style of the primary structure and inconsistent with the guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Staff recommends approval of the rear addition based on findings a through h with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the applicant use woodlap siding on the addition that matches the existing woodlap siding profile as closely as possible. The applicant must submit final elevation drawings indicating the material transition between the original structure and addition, as well as a detail of how the new woodlap siding will be laid, to staff for staff approval. The addition siding should continue the skirting detail found on the primary structure.
 - ii. That the applicant submits the window specification details for all proposed new windows in the addition to staff for approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.
2. Staff recommends approval of the removal of existing openings for the addition based on finding d with the stipulations outlined in recommendation #1.
3. Staff recommends approval of the repair and replacement of existing wood windows based on finding e with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the applicant provides visual evidence of windows that are deteriorated beyond repair to staff for approval. The applicant should submit a final plan indicating where windows will be repaired and replaced on the existing structure.
 - ii. That the applicant provides window specification details for the new windows to be used in the original structure for staff approval.
4. Staff recommends approval of the existing siding repair and replacement based on finding f.
5. Staff recommends approval of the partial roof replacement based on finding g.
6. Staff recommends demolition of the existing accessory structure based on finding i with the following stipulation:
 - i. That the applicant salvages any existing materials to be reused on the property or to be donated.
7. Staff does not recommend approval of the existing accessory structure as submitted at this time based on findings j through o. Staff recommends the following:
 1. That the applicant provides examples of two-story rear accessory structures in the neighborhood to demonstrate its compatibility with the historic district.
 2. That the applicant modifies the proposed windows to comply with the OHP Window Guidelines Policy Document.
 3. That the applicant removes the roof dormers.
 4. That the applicant explores ways to salvage and reuse the woodlap siding from the existing accessory structure in the new garage to provide visual interest while ensuring compatibility with the primary structure and the district as a whole.

CASE COMMENT:

The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on April 26, 2017. The discussion is detailed in finding b.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Paul Kinnison, spoke in opposition to the applicant's request.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Manuela Shannon, Paul Kinnison, John Tanner & Madeline Proctor spoke in opposition to the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Garcia approval with staff stipulations

AYES: Guarino, Conner, Laffoon, Cone, Kamal, Garcia, Grube, Lazarine

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

31. HDRC CASE NO. 2017-219

Applicant: Adrian Garcia

Address: 131 KEARNEY ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to amend a previously approved roof design for a single family residential structure located at 131 Kearney in the Lavaca Historic District.

FINDINGS:

- a. The proposed new construction at 131 Kearney was approved at the April 5, 2017, Historic and Design Review

May 17, 2017

Commission hearing with the following stipulations: i. That the applicant align the front door with the front walkway, locating the door between the proposed two windows as noted in finding d. ii. That the applicant incorporate historic window openings, or openings that are proportionally based on historic window openings into the design as noted in finding i. iii. That the applicant install wood windows that are consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, Window Policy Document as noted in finding n that are to include traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details. iv. That the applicant eliminate the front loaded garage from the front façade plane as noted in finding l. v. That the applicant screen all mechanical equipment. vi. That the applicant install a front walkway that is consistent with the historic walkways found in the Lavaca Historic District as noted in finding o.

b. At this time, the applicant has proposed to modify the previously approved roof design. A side facing gabled roof was previously approved. Currently, the applicant has proposed a high pitched side facing shed roof to be intersected by a side facing gabled roof. The Guidelines for New Construction 2.B.i. notes that similar roof forms as to those found throughout the district should be used. While shed roofs are common throughout the Lavaca Historic District, they are rarely found as side facing shed roofs and are not found at the proposed slope. Staff finds the previously approved side facing gabled roof to be the most appropriate roof form for the new construction in regards to architectural form and reduced massing.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding b. Staff find the previously approved side gabled roof to be consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

32. HDRC CASE NO. 2017-215

Applicant: Jalan Moharam

Address: 306 LAMAR ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval to construct a primary and secondary structure at 306 Lamar.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct a single family structure on the vacant lot at 306 Lamar Street in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. This vacant lot is located near the corner of Lamar and N Cherry.
- b. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on April 12, 2017, where committee members recommended changes to the proposed design including the raising of the proposed foundation height, modifications to proposed window sizes, correcting proportions of the proposed roof forms, removing the front parking location and the correction of other architectural details.
- c. At the April 19, 2017, Historic and Design Review Commission, this request was approved with staff's comments as stipulations. Staff's comments are as follows:
 - i. That the applicant modify the proposed roof forms.
 - ii. That the applicant remove the front porch railings.
 - iii. That the applicant confirm a setback that is consistent with those of the neighboring structures.
 - iv. That the applicant proposed a house width that's consistent with those found in the district.
 - v. That the applicant incorporate appropriate window openings.
 - vi. That the applicant remove the front yard parking location.
 - vii. That the applicant retain at least fifty percent of the front yard turf.
 - viii. That the applicant provide additional information in regards to column design.
- d. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic example found on the block. The applicant has provided a setback that appears to be approximately twenty (20) feet, similar to those found on the block. The applicant should provide staff with additional information noting that the proposed setback is consistent with the historic examples on the block.
- e. ENTRANCES – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrance towards Lamar. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. SCALE & MASS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. The applicant has proposed a one story structure with an overall height that is consistent with the height of historic structures found on this block of Lamar. The applicant has reduced the overall width of the structure per staff's stipulation.
- g. FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation

May 17, 2017

and floor height should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundation and floor heights. Historic structures on this block feature foundation heights of approximately two to three feet. The applicant has proposed a foundation height that is generally consistent with the historic examples found in the district.

h. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed roof forms that include two front gabled roofs, side gabled roofs and a front sloping shed roof. Generally, these roof forms are found throughout the district.

i. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. Generally, the proposed window and door openings have been modified per staff's stipulations to be consistent with the Guidelines.

j. LOT COVERAGE – The building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of total lot area. The applicant's proposed building footprint is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.i.

k. MATERIALS – Regarding materials, the applicant has proposed Hardi board siding, aluminum clad wood windows, an asphalt shingle roof and wood columns. Generally, the proposed materials are consistent with the Guidelines. The applicant should install a smooth finished Hardi board product with a four inch exposure.

l. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – New building should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Generally, staff finds the proposed massing, footprint and materials appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

m. FRONT PORCH DESIGN – The applicant has proposed a front porch that is integrated into the massing of the proposed new construction, generally consistent with the historic massing of front porches. The applicant has proposed vertically oriented front porch railings. Staff finds that the applicant should provide a dimensioned drawing of the proposed railings.

n. COLUMN DESIGN – The applicant has proposed for the structure to feature two front porch columns. At this time, the applicant has not provided information noting the detailing of the proposed columns. Staff recommends the installation of a column that features at least five (5) inches in width and depth that features capital and base trim.

o. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 6., all mechanical equipment should be screened from view at the public right of way. The applicant is responsible for complying with this.

p. REAR DRIVEWAY – The applicant has noted that the proposed driveway will be located to provide access to the site from Fayn Way. Staff finds the proposed driveway location appropriate and consistent with other driveways located at the rear of properties. The proposed driveway's width however, is inconsistent with the Guidelines. The Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B.i. note that driveways should not exceed ten (10) feet in width. Staff recommends the applicant reduce the proposed driveway width to no more than ten (10) feet in width.

q. ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – The applicant has proposed a rear accessory structure in the southeast corner of the lot, located in a location that is historically appropriate. The applicant has proposed an overall footprint for the proposed accessory structure that includes 250 square feet. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

r. ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – The applicant has proposed for the rear accessory structure to feature materials that are consistent with those of the primary structure, including wood doors and aluminum clad wood windows and Hardi board siding. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

s. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has provided a landscaping plan that notes front yard grass, side yard walkways and plantings along the property lines and structure's foundation. Staff finds the proposed site plan appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through s with the following stipulations. The applicant is to provide documents to staff meeting each of the below stipulations prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

- i. That the applicant confirm that the proposed building setbacks is consistent with those found on the block as noted in finding d.
- ii. That the applicant install smooth finished Hardi siding with a four inch exposure.
- iii. That the applicant provide a detailed wall section noting the framing depth of the proposed aluminum clad wood windows. Additionally, the applicant is to install windows are to include traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details.
- iv. That the applicant provide a column detail noting overall dimensions as well as capital and base details.
- v. That the applicant screen all mechanical equipment from view.
- vi. That the applicant reduce the rear driveway to no more than (10) feet in width.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to move for approval with staff stipulations & to include the stipulation that the applicant provide staff with the dimensions and profiles of the recessed window frames.

AYES: Guarino, Conner, Laffoon, Cone, Kamal, Garcia, Grube, Lazarine

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

May 17, 2017

33. HDRC CASE NO. 2017-220

Applicant: Robert Moritz

Address: 313 E LOCUST

POSTPONED BY APPLICANT

34. HDRC CASE NO. 2017-226

Applicant: Ann Lewis/Lewis Sign

Address: 111 W JONES AVE
107 W JONES AVE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install signage at the new construction at 111 W Jones. Included within this request, the applicant has proposed the following:

1. Install a blade sign on the northeast façade at the primary entrance to read “Jones & RIO” to feature an aluminum cabinet with acrylic push through white lettering to be internally illuminated. The sign is to feature yellow and black colors and will feature an overall size of 2’ – 10” in width and 22 (twenty-two) feet in height for a total square footage of approximately 125 square feet. This sign is to face Jones Avenue.
2. Install a channel letter sign on the northeast façade immediately above the primary entrance to read “Leasing Office” to feature aluminum channel letters that are to be indirectly illuminated by LED’s. The sign is to feature yellow and black colors and will feature an overall size of 1’ – 2” in height and 11’ – 3 ½” in length and will feature an overall square footage of approximately 13 square feet. This sign is to face Jones Avenue.
3. Install a channel letter sign on the southeast façade to read “Jones & RIO” to feature an aluminum cabinet with acrylic push through white lettering to be internally illuminated. The sign is to feature yellow and black colors and will feature an overall size of 3’ – 0” in height and 23’ – 0” in length. The sign will feature a total square footage of approximately 126 square feet. This sign is facing the River Walk as is to be located near the top of the façade.
4. Install a blade sign on the west facade to read “Jones & RIO” to feature an aluminum cabinet with acrylic push through white lettering to be internally illuminated. The sign is to feature yellow and black colors and will feature an overall size of 2’ – 10” in width and 22 (twenty-two) feet in height for a total square footage of approximately 132 square feet. This sign is facing the River Walk and is to be located on a terrace level above the River Walk level.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to install building signage at the new construction located at 111 W Jones. The applicant has proposed four total signs.
- b. The applicant has proposed to install a blade sign on the northeast façade at the primary entrance to read “Jones & RIO” to feature an aluminum cabinet with acrylic push through white lettering to be internally illuminated. The sign is to feature yellow and black colors and will feature an overall size of 2’ – 10” in width and 22 (twenty-two) feet in height for a total square footage of approximately 125 square feet. This sign is to face Jones Avenue. Given the location of this sign on Jones Avenue, staff finds its placement and location appropriate. While its square footage exceeds that allowed by the UDC Section 35-678, staff finds that given the overall height and size of the building, this additional square footage is appropriate.
- c. The applicant has proposed to install a channel letter sign on the northeast façade immediately above the primary entrance to read “Leasing Office” to feature aluminum channel letters that are to be indirectly illuminated by LED’s. The sign is to feature yellow and black colors and will feature an overall size of 1’ – 2” in height and 11’ – 3 ½” in length and will feature an overall square footage of approximately 13 square feet. This sign is to face Jones Avenue. Staff finds the location and overall size of this sign to be appropriate. The proposed size, materials and lighting methods are consistent with the UDC Section 35-678.
- d. Facing the River Walk, the applicant has proposed two signs. The first is to be located near the roof of the structure, approximately sixty-five (65) feet above the ground level. This sign is to façade to read “Jones & RIO” to feature an aluminum cabinet with acrylic push through white lettering to be internally illuminated. The sign is to feature yellow and black colors and will feature an overall size of 3’ – 0” in height and 23’ – 0” in length. The sign will feature a total square footage of approximately 126 square feet. The proposed size of this sign is not consistent with the UDC Section 35-681(c) which notes that the maximum allowable signage area for a sign visible from the River Walk shall not exceed eight (8) square feet; however, additional additional square footage may be approved, except in RIO-3.
- e. The second sign that is to face the River Walk is to be located on the bottom level of the new construction and is to read “Jones & RIO” to feature an aluminum cabinet with acrylic push through white lettering to be internally illuminated. The sign is to feature yellow and black colors and will feature an overall size of 2’ – 10” in width and 22 (twenty-two) feet in height. The UDC Section 35-681 notes that square footage for any sign facing the river or

May 17, 2017

on a building that is viewable from the River Walk shall be eight (8) square feet; however, additional square footage may be approved by the HDRC, except in RIO-3, based the scale of the building and the site. Staff finds that additional information including renderings or perspectives from the River Walk may determine an appropriate size for signage.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of items #1 and #2 as submitted based on findings b and c.

Staff does not recommend approval of items #3 based on findings d.

Staff recommends the applicant reduce the proposed square footage and present additional square footages for HDRC approval.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to move for approval of items #1-#3, and denial of item #4.

AYES: Guarino, Conner, Laffoon, Cone, Kamal, Garcia, Grube, Lazarine

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

35. HDRC CASE NO. 2017-218

Applicant: Nick Harris/FSG

Address: ST PAUL SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT, Bound by the Union Pacific Railroad to the east, Montana to the south, IH 37 S Access Road to the East and approximately N Center to the north.

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to develop a master signage plan for the St. Paul Square Historic District. The proposed master signage plan is to include on premise, wayfinding and direction signage. The applicant has also proposed kiosks to be located throughout the district.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval for a master signage plan for the St Paul Square Historic District. The proposed master signage plan is to include on premise, wayfinding and direction signage. The applicant has also proposed kiosks to be located throughout the district. The proposed signage will be located in the public right of way. The applicant is responsible for obtaining the proper permits and approvals for the installation of signage in the public right of way.

b. ROUND PANELS – The applicant has proposed a series of single sided round signage panels that are to read “St Paul Square” and vary in sizes from 42 inches in length and 28 inches in height to 36 inches in length and 24 inches in height. The proposed signage panels are to be made from routed aluminum with applied vinyl graphics. The panels are to be located on existing street light poles, existing street lamp poles and existing bridge supports. Generally, staff finds the proposed design appropriate for a commercial historic district.

c. SQUARE PANELS – The applicant has proposed square signage panels that are to read “St Paul Square” that are to be located on existing street lamps. The proposed panels are to feature 28 inches in length and 8 inches in height. The proposed signage panels are to be made from routed aluminum with applied vinyl graphics. Generally, staff finds the proposed design appropriate for a commercial historic district.

d. DIRECTIONAL SIGNAGE – The applicant has proposed to install directional signage panels to be three-sided on existing street lamps noting directions to the Alamodome, Park and Ride stations, the Alamo and convention center. The panels will be constructed of aluminum panels with applied vinyl graphics. Staff finds the proposed materials and signage appropriate.

e. BUILDING SIGNAGE – The applicant has proposed to apply building signage reading “St Paul Square” to various structures throughout the district. The proposed signage is to be aluminum with vinyl applied graphics and feature eight feet in length and approximately 5.5 feet in height. Staff finds the installation of the proposed signage on a historic structure, at this size to be inappropriate and inconsistent with the Guidelines. Signage would not have historically existing in this manner.

f. BRIDGE SIGNAGE – The applicant has proposed to install signage on the existing pedestrian bridge over E Commerce Street. The proposed signage is to be 13’ – 6” in length and 4’ – 0” in height and feature aluminum panels with vinyl applied graphics. This signage is to be indirectly illuminated. Staff finds that the proposed new signage should be consistent with the existing signage at this location in regards to size.

g. DIRECTORY TOWER – At the corner of Hoefgen Avenue and E Commerce, the applicant has proposed to install a direction directory signage tower. The applicant has provided documents noting the proposed scale, which staff finds larger than appropriate. Staff finds the installation of a directory of businesses and structures at this location appropriate; however, that structure should respond to the site and architecture of the district.

h. WALL INFORMATIONAL DISPLAYS – The applicant has proposed a number of informational displays to be mounted to walls. Staff finds the installation of these directories to be appropriately sized and scaled.

May 17, 2017

RECOMMENDATION:

Generally staff finds the proposed master signage plan to be appropriate and recommends conceptual approval of all proposed signage with the exception of the proposed wall signage and directory tower. Staff does not find the installation of district signage on individual structures to be appropriate nor does staff find the proposed scale of the directory tower to be appropriate.

The applicant is to return to the HDRC for approval of all signage sizes, locations and designs

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Kamal to move for approval with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Conner, Laffoon, Cone, Kamal, Garcia, Grube, Lazarine

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

36. HDRC CASE NO. 2017-248

Applicant: Mark Tolley/Mission DG, LTD

Address: 222 E MITCHELL ST

POSTPONED BY APPLICANT

37. HDRC CASE NO. 2017-231

Applicant: Cody Doege

Address: 402 E LOCUST

POSTPONED BY APPLICANT

Move to Adjourn:

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor & seconded by Commissioner Kamal to adjourn.

AYES: Guarino, Conner, Laffoon, Cone, Kamal, Garcia,

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

- Executive Session: Consultation on attorney – client matters (real estate, litigation, contracts, personnel, and security matters) as well as the above mentioned agenda items may be discussed under Chapter 551 of the Texas Government Code.
- Adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:40 PM.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino
Chair